


ARCA
Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

46

ANASTASIUS I
POLITICS AND EMPIRE IN THE
LATE ROMAN WORLD

F. K. HAARER



General Editors
Neil Adkin (University of Nebraska – Lincoln)
Francis Cairns (The Florida State University)
Robin Seager (University of Liverpool)
Frederick Williams (Queen's University, Belfast)
Assistant Editor: Sandra Cairns

ISSN 0309-5541



FRANCIS CAIRNS

Institut d'histoire romaine

Published by Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd
PO Box 296, Cambridge, CB4 3GE, Great Britain

First published 2006

Copyright © F. K. Haarer 2006
The moral rights of the author have been asserted

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights association. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Publisher at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 905205 43 X
ISBN 978 0 905205 43 4

The Greek fonts used in this work are available from
www.linguistsoftware.com ☎ +1-425-775-1130

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Limited, Chippenham, Wiltshire

For my parents & Peter

Contents

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xi
1 INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	1
2 THE ISAURIAN REVOLT	11
Geographical and Political Boundaries 13. The Balance of Power: Isaurians and Germans 15. The Emperor Zeno 18. Anastasius and the Isaurians 21. The First Years of Hostilities 22. Victory for Anastasius. 26.	
3 EASTERN FOREIGN POLICY	29
Relations with Arab tribes: military negotiations, religious affiliation and economic policy 29. The Persian War 502–506 47. The Eastern Defensive Building Programme 65. The Eastern Frontier 506–518 70.	
4 WESTERN FOREIGN POLICY	73
I. Constantinople and ‘Old Rome’	73
Theoderic’s Constitutional Position 80. The Doctrinal Schism of 491–506 89. War in the Balkans 91. Diplomacy and the West 93. The Doctrinal Schism of 516 100. Conclusion 102.	
II. Foreign Policy in the Balkans	104
The Long Wall 106. The Defensive Building Programme in the Balkans 109.	
5 RELIGIOUS POLICY: THE SEARCH FOR COMPROMISE	115
Council of Chalcedon: Background and Aftermath 116. The Accession of Anastasius 125. Relations with the Popes: Gelasius 128; Anastasius II 132. The Laurentian Schism 133. Anastasius and the East: the Deposition of Euphemius 136. The Rise of the Monophysites 139. The Triumph of the Monophysites, 508–512 145. The Trishagion, 512, and Riots in Constantinople 156. The Orthodox Backlash 157. Developments in the Balkans 163. The Revolt of Vitalian 164. The Beginning of the Conflict 167. The Second Stage of Conflict 169. The Defeat of Vitalian 175. Further Negotiations with the Pope 180. Conclusion 182.	
6 ADMINISTRATION AND DOMESTIC POLICY	184
Overview of the economy and administration of the later Roman Empire 185. The Court and Imperial Officials 190. Financial Reforms 193. The <i>Chrysargyron</i> 194. The <i>Res Privata</i> and <i>Patrimonium</i> 197. The Commutation of the Land Tax 199. The Coinage Reform 202. The Introduction of the <i>Vindices</i> and the <i>Defensor Civitatis</i> ; the Decline of the	

Curiales? 207. Agrarian Legislation 211. Army Reforms 213. Other Economic and Social Reforms 216. The Abydus Edict 217. Reductions and rebates of taxes 221. Legislation concerning officials, family matters, the courts and the judiciary 222. Governing the people; factions, riots and the emperor's response 223. Conclusion 229.

7 ANASTASIUS' BUILDING PROGRAMME	230
Utilitarian Projects 231. Bathhouses and city improvements 233. Building for prestige: churches 238. Imperial cities 242	

8 CONCLUSION	246
--------------	-----

APPENDIXES	255
A. Notes on the Primary Sources	272
B. Dating the Panegyrics	279
C. The Popes and Patriarchs (491–518)	280
D. The 510/511 Formula of Satisfaction (τύπος τῆς πληροφορίας)	282
E. Key Ministers and Officers (491–518)	285
F. Legislation (491–518)	288
G. Bibliographic Notes	293
Glossary	297
Bibliography	327
Index Locorum	338
General Index	

* * *

MAPS	xiv
Constantinople	12
Isauria	30
Eastern Frontier	32
Palestine, the Red Sea and Arabian Peninsula	110
The Balkans	236
Scythopolis	240
The Tur 'Abdin	

Preface and Acknowledgements

This book aims to provide a narrative and evaluation of the political, economic, military and religious policies pursued at the turn of the sixth century by the late Roman emperor, Anastasius I. Imperial biography as a genre of historiography is sometimes considered outmoded by its critics today, yet the study of the reign of an emperor can reveal very effectively the wider picture of the governance of empire and allow us to explore the complexities of interlocking strategies and reforms in every sphere of imperial policy. It is also the case that this was a time when the character of the emperor could be all important. The impact of the personality of Justinian on the shape of the sixth century is not undisputed but Anastasius also stamped his own identity on the empire in terms of his prudent economic and foreign policies which form the central focus of this book.

These themes were originally explored in my doctoral thesis, *The Reign of Anastasius I, 491–518* (Oxford 1998), and it gives me great pleasure to thank those who have advised and encouraged me in writing both the thesis and book. I am very grateful to my supervisor, Elizabeth Jeffreys, who has continued to provide support and encouragement over the years. My examiners, Averil Cameron and Peter Heather, made many helpful comments which I have sought to incorporate into the book. I would also like to thank James Howard-Johnston who supervised my M. Phil thesis, *Politics and administration, court and culture in the reign of Anastasius I, 491–518* (Oxford 1996).

Most of the work revising the thesis for publication has been carried out while holding a lectureship in the Department of Classics at King's College London, which has provided a stimulating and supportive environment and where my colleagues, particularly Lindsay Allen, Judith Herrin, Dominic Rathbone and Charlotte Roueché, have offered advice and encouragement. In 2002, I organised a colloquium at the Institute of Classical Studies, London, on *New Approaches to the Reign of Anastasius*, and benefited from discussions with Geoffrey Greatrex, John Watt, Jim Crow, Michael Metcalf and Richard Price who presented papers and provided me with insights into their own research on particular aspects of Anastasius' reign.

For suggestions and references, I am grateful to Jonathan Bardill, Jim Crow, Ken Dark, Leah di Segni, Adam Gutteridge, Robert Hoyland, Sean Kingsley, Marlia Mango, Przemyslaw Marciniak, Charlotte Roueché, Mary Whitby and John Wilkes. I am especially grateful to Geoffrey Greatrex and Emma Hornby for reading drafts of particular chapters and for all their helpful comments, and to Francis and Sandra Cairns for their invaluable guidance in shaping the transformation of the text from thesis to book. I am greatly indebted to Kathryn Imre who produced the maps and the plans with so much care.

Finally, I must thank my parents and Peter who have not only provided practical help in reading drafts of the whole book and in discussing the problems and issues of Anastasius' reign, but have also offered so much reassurance and inspiration over the years.

King's College London, June 2006

Abbreviations

<i>AB</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
<i>ASRS</i>	<i>Archivio della Società romana di storia patria</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>British Archaeological Reports, International Series</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BBBS</i>	<i>Bulletin of British Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>BS</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sanctorum</i> , ed. F. Caraffa, Rome 1961–1969, 12 vols.
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of African and Oriental Studies</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CAH</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> , edd. A. Cameron, B. Ward-Perkins and M. Whitby, Cambridge 2000, vol. XIV, 'Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425–600'.
<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , Berolini 1828–1877.
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> , Berolini 1862–1886.
<i>CHIr.</i>	<i>Cambridge History of Iran</i> , ed. E. Yarshater, Cambridge 1983, vol. III(1), 'The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian Periods'.
<i>CMH</i>	<i>Cambridge Mediaeval History</i> , vol. I, 'The Christian Empire', edd. H.M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney, Cambridge 1911, and vol. IV, 'The Byzantine Empire', ed. J.M. Hussey, Cambridge 1966–1967.
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>
<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
<i>CTh</i>	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i> , ed. Th. Mommsen, Berlin 1905.
<i>DACL</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i> , ed. F. Cabrol, Paris 1907–1953, 15 vols.
<i>DHGE</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques</i> , Paris 1912–.
<i>DMA</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Middle Ages</i> , New York, 1982–1989.
<i>DOP</i>	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
<i>DTC</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i> , edd. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, Paris 1903–1950.
<i>EHĠ</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>EI</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Iranica</i> , ed. E. Yarshater, London 1985–.
<i>ESI</i>	<i>Excavations and Surveys in Israel</i>
<i>FHG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , ed. C. Müller, Paris 1851, vol. IV, 1870, vol. V.
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>HJG</i>	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch Görres Gesellschaft</i>
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>

- IGLS *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, edd. L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, Paris 1929–1982, 7 vols.
- ILS *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, ed. H. Dessau, Berlin 1954, vol. I.
- IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal*
- JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
- JEA *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
- JESHO *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*
- JHS *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
- JÖB *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinistik*
- JÖBG *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*
- JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
- JRA *Journal of Roman Archaeology*
- JRS *Journal of Roman Studies*
- JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*
- MAH *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*
- MGH, AA *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, Berlin 1877–1919.
- OC *Oriens Christianum*
- OCD *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1970 (2nd edition).
- ODB *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford 1991, 3 vols.
- NCirc *Numismatic Circular*
- OS *Orientalia Suecana*
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J.P. Migne, Paris 1857–1866.
- PL *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, Paris 1844–1865.
- PLRE *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, J.R. Martindale, Cambridge 1980, vol. II, A.D. 395–527.
- PO *Patrologia Orientalis*, Paris 1903–.
- P.Oxy. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edd. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, London 1898–.
- PW *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa, Stuttgart 1893–.
- RESE *Revue des études sud-est européennes*
- RH *Revue historique*
- RHE *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
- ROC *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*
- SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
- Sel. Let. *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus patriarch of Antioch*, ed. E.W. Brooks, London 1903–1904.
- TM *Travaux et Mémoires*
- Val. III Nov. *Valentinian III, Novellae*, in *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. P. Meyer, Berlin 1905, vol. II.

Ariadne offered reassurances to the citizens of Constantinople: she had asked the ministers, senate and army to select an emperor who was Roman, a Christian and full of every royal virtue.

Meanwhile, back in front of the Delphax in the imperial palace, senior ministers and Euphemius, the patriarch of Constantinople, were discussing the question of succession. The *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, Urbicius, proposed that the choice should be left to Ariadne herself, and she selected the silentiary, Anastasius. The court intrigue and machinations which must have led to this appointment are mostly obscured from us, but a few tantalising hints may be recovered in the extant sources. Little is known about Anastasius' early life and career, but he must have been a well-known figure at the imperial court.⁶ He came from the town of Dyrrhachium (ancient Epidamnus) in Nova Epirus, the last point on the Via Egnatia, but Anastasius was certainly considered 'Roman' by birth and to be preferred over any Isaurian candidate. Although he pursued a career in the imperial palace, he also involved himself in the religious life of the capital by giving his own private sermons to a select congregation in the Great Church, an action which, however, incurred the wrath of the patriarch: "When Euphemius saw Anastasius creating a riot, he overturned his chair in the church and threatened him that, unless he stopped, he would tonsure his head and parade him in mockery among the crowd. He brought the charge before Zeno and received authority over Anastasius".⁷ Anastasius' interest in preaching was not mere amateurism, however, since he was also a candidate for the patriarchy of Antioch in 488 after the death of Peter the Fuller.⁸ His interest and involvement in doctrinal matters was to continue throughout his reign, although his religious policy did little to lessen the widening gap between the eastern and western church and the hardening of the schism between the orthodox and monophysites. Euphemius expressed his objections to the appointment of Anastasius and only agreed to carry out his role in the coronation ceremony when the new emperor agreed to sign a written declaration of orthodoxy accepting the council of Chalcedon.⁹

⁶ On the office and duties of silentiaries, see ch. 6, n.31. For a reconstruction of Anastasius' early career, Capizzi (1969) 47–70.

⁷ ... ὃν ὄχλοποιούντα ὁρῶν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καθέδραν αὐτῷ ἀνέστρεψεν, ἀπειλήσας αὐτῷ, ὥς, εἰ μὴ παύσῃτο, ἀποκεῖται τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις αὐτὸν θριαμβεύσαι. ἐπεκάλεσεν δὲ καὶ Ζήνωνι, καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἔλαβεν. Theod. Lect. 441; Theoph. AM 5982 (tr. Mango and Scott).

⁸ Theod. Lect. 445, Vict. Tun. 491, Theoph. AM 5983, Niceph. Call. XVI.20.

⁹ As relations between emperor and patriarch deteriorated in the early years of the 490s, this signed declaration of faith was to become a serious matter of contention; cf. ch. 5, p. 127.

The crucial factor, however, in Anastasius' accession was surely his close personal connections at the imperial court. While he had not yet reached the rank of senator, his position as a silentiary, perhaps serving the empress Ariadne, brought him into contact with the highest echelons. Silentaries were under the jurisdiction of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* and hence Anastasius would have been known to Urbicius who had worked at the imperial court for over fifty years and must have already been in his seventies by 491. As a *praepositus*, Urbicius would have enjoyed close access to the imperial couple and could draw on a long experience of the workings of court life.¹⁰ Given Zeno's ill health and the need to close out Longinus from the accession, it is natural that discussions concerning the appointment of a new emperor had already taken place within court circles. It is likely that Urbicius knew Ariadne's favoured choice of successor, and it seems that there were no objections to entrusting the widowed empress with the appointment. Of course, this tactic may have been a ploy to circumvent the hopes of Longinus whose claim to the throne would naturally have been supported by his fellow Isaurians who occupied some of the key military and administrative positions. These included the *magister officiorum*, Longinus of Kardala, who had been in post since 484, and Athenodorus, a powerful senator. Both were banished in 491 by Anastasius. As noted above, it is likely that the unpopular city prefect of 491 was also an Isaurian. Zeno's brother, Longinus, had himself held a number of important posts, including a second consulship in 490 and the post of *magister militum praesentalis* in 491. Others, however, would have been present to support the cause of Anastasius; and indeed, it is significant that not all those connected with the old regime were exiled by the new emperor. For example, John the Scythian, *magister militum per Orientem* 483–498, may have helped to crush the rebellion of Illus and Leontius under Zeno, but he remained in post to prosecute the war in Isauria, his experience of guerrilla warfare in these mountainous regions paying dividends in 497 with the capture of Longinus of Kardala and Athenodorus. The praetorian prefect Arcadius, who had opposed Zeno's murder of the ex-silentiary, Pelagius, on spurious grounds and narrowly escaped death himself, no doubt also supported a change of regime.¹¹ If he can be identified as the Arcadius who was the addressee of an undated law (promulgated sometime between 491 and 505), it is clear that he too remained in post. It would also be illuminating to trace back the careers of those who would

¹⁰ Clauss (1984) III.1245–1257; *PLRE* II.1188–1190, n.1.

¹¹ On Pelagius' fate, see below.

become the key ministers in Anastasius' government: did they play a role in his accession to be rewarded with top jobs later? Unfortunately, the available evidence does not allow such detailed analysis. It may only be noted that leading officials such as Polycarp, John the Paphlagonian, and Marinus all held positions in the *scrinium Orientis* (the financial sub-department of the praetorian prefect), and it is possible that they were already known to Anastasius at the court.

That Ariadne chose Anastasius as the new emperor and also married him a month later (20th May), naturally gave rise to speculation that they had already enjoyed intimate relations while Zeno was still alive; and the latter's death was not without suspicious circumstances.¹² Zachariah of Mytilene reported that Anastasius had enjoyed, when he was a soldier, the favour of Ariadne, who wished to make him emperor.¹³ It is clear, however, that if Ariadne enjoyed more than the services Anastasius offered as a silentary, no whisper ever reached the ears of her suspicious husband. According to Malalas, after the death of his only son Zeno consulted the seer Maurianus who revealed that an ex-silentary would marry Ariadne and become the next emperor. Zeno immediately arrested the distinguished and learned patrician Pelagius who was an ex-silentary, and had him strangled. Given that the praetorian prefect, Arcadius, who protested at this murder, escaped the same fate only by seeking refuge in the Great Church, it is likely that Zeno had no inkling of his wife's relationship with Anastasius, if it ever existed.¹⁴ As for accounts of Zeno's death, it is significant that contemporary sources give its cause as dysentery.¹⁵ A sensational tradition did not develop until much later when Cedrenus and Zonaras related that Zeno, having become unconscious, was, apparently, buried alive and although he shouted from within, Ariadne forbade the sarcophagus to be opened.¹⁶

Despite Anastasius' advanced age at his accession (at around sixty he must have been about the same age as Zeno and cannot have been expected to enjoy a long reign), the sources are unanimous in their description of his height, dignified appearance and imposing presence. Malalas recorded that "He was very tall, with short hair, a good figure, a round face, both hair and beard greying ..." ¹⁷ and Zachariah of

Mytilene noted that Anastasius was of very great stature, with a sane and faithful mind.¹⁸ Even the hostile Oracle of Baalbek wrote: "He is bald, handsome, his forehead (shines) like silver, he has a long right arm, he is noble, terrifying, high-souled ...".¹⁹ John the Lydian praised his qualities of wisdom, good education, kindness, generosity, and controlled temper.²⁰ Anastasius' rather more charismatic personality may have appealed to the citizens of Constantinople as much as to Ariadne, and he was surely a welcome contrast to Zeno who was condemned in the sources for his cowardice, incompetence and dissolute way of life.²¹ Anastasius' ability to manipulate an emotive audience was borne out by his handling of a riot later in his reign when he appeared in the hippodrome without his diadem and offered to resign, a gesture which seemingly won over the crowd.²²

After Ariadne had named Anastasius successor, he was brought to the *Consistorium*, and the funeral rites for Zeno were performed. On 11th April, the officials, now dressed in white, were received by Anastasius in the *Consistorium*. All of them processed to the portico of the *triklinos* of the Nineteen Couches where Anastasius gave an oath that he would distress no person against whom he had a grudge, and would govern conscientiously. The procession then advanced to the *triklinos* of the hippodrome where he dressed in the imperial tunic, girdle, leggings and red boots before proceeding to the *kathisma* where he received the acclamations of the citizens and soldiers. He was raised on a shield, the soldiers raised their standards and the torc was placed on his head. After further acclamations he returned to the *triklinos* where Euphemius covered him with the imperial cloak and crowned him. Appearing again in the hippodrome, he promised the customary donative of five *nomismata* and a pound of silver to each soldier, and received their acclamations. Chief among these were the injunctions: "Reign as you have lived! You have lived piously, reign piously!"²³

ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ, ὀφθαλμῷ ἔχων τὴν κόρην γλαυκὴν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀριστερῷ μέλαιναν, τελείους ἔχων ὀφθαλμούς, τὸ δὲ γένειον αὐτοῦ πυκνῶς ἐκείρετο.) (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott).

¹⁸ Zach. of Myt. VII.1.

¹⁹ ἔστι δὲ φαλακρός, εὐπρεπής, ὡς ἄργυρος τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, τὴν δεξιὰν χεῖρα ἔχων μακράν, γενναῖος, φοβερός, μεγαλόψυχος ... Oracle of Baalbek 166–168 (tr. Alexander).

²⁰ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.47.

²¹ See e.g. Malch. fr.3, 5, 16, 18.3, Evag. III.1–2, although the bias of the sources should be taken into account; cf. Laniado (1991).

²² The riot was over the monophysite addition to the *Trishagion* in 512; cf. chapter 5. Anastasius' successful handling of this crisis has been compared to Justinian's heavy-handed approach during the *Nika* riot in 532.

²³ ὡς ἔζησας, οὕτω βασιλεύσον. εὐσεβῶς ἔζησας, εὐσεβῶς βασιλεύσον.

¹² Cf. Capizzi (1969) 74, n.16.

¹³ Zach. of Myt. VII.1.

¹⁴ Cf. Mal. 390.

¹⁵ Mal. 391; Theoph. AM 5983 gives the cause of death as epilepsy.

¹⁶ Cedr. 622, Zon. XIV.31–35.

¹⁷ Mal. 392 continues "he had a grey pupil in his right eye and a black one in his left though his eyesight was perfect; and he shaved his beard frequently" (ἦν δὲ μακρὸς πᾶν, κονδόθριξ, εὐστολας, στρογγύλοψις, μιξοπόλιος τὴν κάραν καὶ τὸ γένειον,

indicating that, despite Euphemius' concerns over his doctrinal persuasion, the citizens of Constantinople were satisfied with Anastasius' reputation for piety. Along with general hopes for their prosperity ("May the fortune of the Romans flourish") they also drew the attention of the new emperor to two specific demands: the expulsion of informers and the restoration of the army.²⁴

When the acclamations, the subsequent thanksgiving in the Great Church and the banquets were over, it was time for Anastasius to turn his attention to the troubled empire he had inherited. A study of his reign opens a window onto the politics of the late fifth and early sixth centuries, a crucial period in late Roman history prior to the rule of Justinian, whose many achievements were underpinned by Anastasius' success in tightening administration, improving the economic outlook of the empire, and securing peace and stability on the frontiers. The latter's long experience in the imperial court and familiarity with state bureaucracy and protocol had left him a shrewd administrator and economist. The key issues pertinent to the late fifth century and which would dominate Anastasius' long reign have already been identified: the predominance of the Isaurians in the imperial capital, religious schisms, and the struggling state economy. To these may be added issues of foreign policy: on the eastern frontier, relations with the Arab tribes and war against the Persians; in the west, diplomacy towards the Ostrogoths, Franks and Burgundians, and an attempt to improve security in the Balkans. Because of the vilification of Zeno in the sources, an evaluation of his reign, and hence the state of the empire Anastasius inherited, is problematic. It is certain that the new emperor's expulsion of the Isaurians from the capital and the successful prosecution of war in the mountains of Isauria won him great popularity. At the beginning of his reign, it was important for Anastasius to remove the threat of a coup headed by the disappointed Longinus, and the public display and execution of the Isaurian leaders at the close of the war allowed him to capitalise on his popular victory. The war marked the end of not only the perceived instability of Zeno's reign, peppered with the internal revolts of Basiliscus, Marcian and Illus, and the depredations of the Theoderics, but also a period of Constantinopolitan politics characterised by the successive periods of dominance by Goths and Isaurians. An additional benefit to Anastasius would be the substantial profit to the treasury caused by the cancellation of the annual donation to the Isaurians introduced by Illus in 484, and the

confiscation of all Isaurian property. The political and financial benefits of the Isaurian war were clear.

At the close of the Isaurian war, Anastasius was free to turn his attention towards the administration of the empire. While the low level of the imperial fisc may not have been solely Zeno's fault, it seems he had no opportunity or inclination to turn his attention to the financial recovery or the administrative needs of the empire. The tribute paid to the Ostrogoths in later years and the payments made by Zeno himself to maintain the loyalty of his Isaurians during the war against Illus made further inroads into the treasury, already depleted by the naval expedition of Leo I in 468 and the expenses of Basiliscus. While the hostile sources no doubt exaggerated Zeno's ineptitude and lavishness, it does appear that efforts to refill the treasury consisted largely of the unethical measure of the praetorian prefect, Sebastianus, who demanded official suffragium, a payment to the treasury for every office, and who even sold the rights of appointing officials.²⁵ It is in this area of government that Anastasius would have been most able to draw on his long experience at the court, and there is no doubt that he devised a complex policy: innovative, responsive and effective. As suggested earlier, he may have already known the employees of the *scrinia* (Polycarp, John the Paphlagonian and Marinus) who, along with a number of experienced lawyers (including Leontius and Sergius), would carry out the key reforms. It is especially notable, for example, that Polycarp and John were in post (praetorian prefect and *comes sacrarum largitionum* respectively) in 498 when a group of high profile reforms were passed: the abolition of the *chrysargyron*, the reorganisation of the *res privata*, the commutation of the land tax, and the first stage of the coinage reform. Tightening of bureaucratic procedures, the regulation of the conduct of officials, improvements to the judicial system, family law and the collection of taxes all contributed to the smoother running and greater prosperity of the empire. With the imperial treasury flourishing, Anastasius could afford to cut taxes and give generous handouts to stricken provinces, and to mastermind a building programme, in which he built and restored churches and monasteries, improved utilities in the capital and provinces, and carried out essential work on fortifications and lines of defence. Justin, and particularly Justinian, must have been grateful to Anastasius for the three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of gold they inherited, for without it, the latter would have found it difficult to fund his grandiose projects of reconquest and restoration which were so fundamental to the ideology of his reign.

²⁴ νικᾷ ἡ τύχη τῶν Ῥωμαίων ... τοὺς δηλᾶτορας ἔξω βάλε ... τὰς στρατείας συ-
ἐγειρον ...

²⁵ Malch. fr. 7, 16; cf. Bury (1923) I.401, Jones (1964) I.229.

Concern for effective administration may also be found in areas of foreign policy. In 498, the island of Iotabe in the gulf of Aqaba at the top of the Red Sea, previously held by the Arab Amorkesos, was recaptured by one of Anastasius' officers, Romanus. Control of Iotabe meant direct access to Indian trade and the collection of lucrative custom duties. A fragmentary inscription found in several locations in Arabia records the reissue of laws concerning changes to the administration of customs and the regulation of ranks of officials. Such legislation suggests Anastasius' concern to ensure efficiency and strengthen the economy on the eastern frontier at a time when relations with Persia were becoming strained.

Related to this activity is another key strategy of Anastasius' policy of government: diplomacy. In the east, prior to the outbreak of war against Persia, Anastasius moved to cement a new alliance with the increasingly powerful Ghassanids, encouraging their loyalty by promoting their cultural and religious integration. Such steps, of course, could not prevent the easy successes enjoyed by the Persian army in 502 on a border where fortifications had been neglected and manpower limited. Neither Zeno nor Anastasius, though both might have anticipated the outbreak of hostilities, had sought to improve defences on the eastern frontier. Anastasius was fortunate that his army was eventually able to contain the Persian advance and to negotiate a treaty which compares favourably, at least in terms of cost, with later treaties of Justinian. Moreover, after the close of war, as noted above, Anastasius did begin to improve defences on the border, especially with the fortification of Dara, renamed Anastasiopolis.

Diplomacy was also required to handle the delicate relationship with the Ostrogoths who were now occupying Italy, the heart of the old Roman empire. Although Zeno had invited Theoderic to remove the Scirian Odoacer and rule in his place, largely in an attempt to remove the Ostrogothic leader from the environs of Constantinople, he had never defined Theoderic's constitutional position. The ambiguity was reflected in Theoderic's limited use of imperial prerogatives on the one hand, and on the other, his imperial-style visit to Rome in 500 and his large-scale building programme. More worrying for Anastasius were Ostrogothic plans for expansion: in the Balkans, the capture of Sirmium from the Gepids; and in the west, the attempt to bind the Visigoths, Burgundians, Franks and Vandals by various marriage alliances. While continuing his efforts to establish a *modus vivendi* with Theoderic, Anastasius reacted to this threat of imperialist expansion by a bout of energetic diplomatic overtures of his own. The Frankish king, Clovis, was weaned away from alliance with Theoderic to enjoy a

special relationship with the Romans, encouraged by the reward of an honorary consulship. Anastasius was also successful in promoting close relations with the king of the Burgundians, Gundobad, and especially his son and successor, Sigismund.

There is no doubt that Anastasius' dealings with Theoderic in Italy were complicated by the doctrinal schism between the churches of the east and west, and it is clear that, with regard to religious policy generally, imperial diplomacy did not achieve the same success it enjoyed in other areas of government. At his accession, the church was still enduring the ramifications of the council of Chalcedon. The *Henoticon* of Zeno, composed by his patriarch, angered the pope on two counts: firstly, it ignored the definition of faith agreed at Chalcedon which the church of Rome held to underpin the orthodox faith; secondly, an emperor had seen fit to dictate church policy. The pope and patriarch excommunicated each other, resulting in the thirty-five year long Acacian schism. Anastasius' attempt to heal the rift with the church of Rome failed, the doctrinal differences no doubt exacerbated by the unhelpful role played by successive popes in negotiations between himself and Theoderic. The emperor's personal inclination towards monophysitism which so concerned Euphemius, the rise of powerful monophysite leaders such as Philoxenus and Severus, and his concern not to alienate the monophysite citizens of the eastern provinces (at a time when they were exposed to Persian aggression) led to a deepening of the schism within the eastern church.

A final theme of Anastasius' government relating to provision of frontier security is the commencement of a programme of defensive fortifications. Reference has already been made to the improvements carried out on the eastern frontier after the end of the Persian war. The construction and repair work was largely responsible for the twenty years of peace following the 506 treaty. In the west, in response to threats against the capital, Anastasius repaired or built the Long Wall, and archaeological evidence for a coherent strategy of fortification in the Balkans is beginning to emerge, contrary to Procopius' *de Aedificiis* which credits such works to Justinian alone. Prudent management of the fisc meant that Anastasius was able to carry out this building programme.

Systematic analysis of the key aspects of Anastasius' rule is crucial for an understanding of the issues facing the late Roman world in the late fifth and early sixth century and allows us to evaluate the successes and failures of imperial government during his reign. Such an approach highlights the complex fabric of reforms and strategies seen in domestic and foreign policy, as well as the difficulties incurred in the


management of, for example, the religious schisms. That the balance in the imperial treasury at Anastasius' death was, as already mentioned, three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of gold is testimony to government success in directing the administration and economy of the empire. In April 491, however, the priority of the new regime must have been merely to establish itself. Thus, assessment of Anastasius' reign must begin with the rival claim to the throne: the rise and fall of the Isaurians in the second half of the fifth century.

2

THE ISAURIAN REVOLT

The first eight years of Anastasius' reign (491–498) saw the emperor largely preoccupied with the uprising of the barbaric and generally peripheral Isaurians, who had lately become the dominant force in east Roman politics. Starting out as brigands and pirates, previously a recurrent source of harassment on the edges of the empire, the Isaurians now held some of the key posts at the apex of imperial government in Constantinople. But how to explain this meteoric rise? It was a considerable achievement which had grown out of Roman misgivings about relying on one race of barbarians (the Goths) to secure the frontiers of the empire against the depredations of another (the Huns). After years of continual aggression against the empire, the Isaurians were now deployed within the system as a counter-balance against German dominance. But there would always be Roman distaste for dependence on any force other than the imperial army, and natural antipathy towards the Isaurians quickly developed to hostility as the leading tribesmen moved from powerful positions in the military to influential political offices. When Anastasius took the throne in 491, the empire had seen seventeen years of rule by the Isaurian emperor, Zeno, and contemporary evidence suggests that the succession of his brother Longinus would not have been tolerated. Zeno had not brought peace and security to the empire and the sparring between Zeno and Illus had been at the empire's expense.¹ With universal dissatisfaction in the capital, the temptation for Anastasius to make a clean sweep and exile all Isaurians was too attractive. How better to secure his own position, and the gratitude of both government and people? The ensuing war

¹ Illus was a powerful Isaurian general who came to Constantinople in the second half of the fifth century. He held several key positions, including those of *magister officiorum*, *magister militum per Orientem* and the consulship, but did not always back Zeno: he initially supported the coup of Basiliscus and from 484 supported the rival emperor, Leontius.



sparked by this expulsion and Anastasius' unexpected victory — guerilla warfare in the mountains of Isauria hardly afforded the advantage to the imperial forces — further enhanced the emperor's prestige and popularity. But to recognise fully the extent of the achievement in effectively crushing Isaurian defiance towards the empire, and to understand the psychological and political reaction in Constantinople,² a more detailed analysis is needed of the nature of Romano-Isaurian relations.

Geographical and Political Boundaries

In antiquity, the area of Isauria was incorporated under the general heading of Cilicia, corresponding roughly to the sub-division of Cilicia Tracheia (Rough Cilicia). The coastal province of Cilicia had for its boundaries the Taurus mountains to the north, the Melas river to the east (forming a boundary with Pamphylia) and the Amanus mountains to the west (the Syrian border). Cilicia Tracheia formed the western part and was a mountainous region, quite unlike the rich and populous plains of Cilicia Pedias to the east.³ Tracheia first fell into Roman hands as part of the lands bequeathed to the senate in 133 B.C. by King Attalus III of Pergamum.⁴ The rapid degeneration of the inhabitants of this area into brigandage and piracy⁵ brought them into conflict with Rome which was to continue for the next five centuries. Several attempts were made to curb their piratical activity, including the intervention of P. Servilius Vatia in 78–75 B.C.,⁶ and Pompey the Great in

² Capizzi (1969) 90.

³ For a detailed discussion of the name and geography of Isauria, see Capizzi (1969) 90 with references to the relevant primary material, Mitford (1980) 1230–1234, Shaw (1990) 199–203, Hill (1996) 3, Lenski (1999) 413–417 and on ethnicity, see especially Burgess (1990) and Elton (2000). The Isaurians are mentioned first by Homer, *Iliad* VI.184–185 and are found in Herodotus, *Histories*, I.28, II.17, II.34 and VII.91. They were also known as the ancient Solymi, cf. Proc. Pan. 9, Prisc. Pan. 81, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *History of the Monks of Syria* X.5; "... who of those who live in our part of the world has not heard of the misfortunes that occurred at this time because of those formerly called Solymi and now Isaurians" (τίς γὰρ τῶν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένην οἰκούντων ἀνήκοος τῶν κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν συμβηβεκότων κακῶν ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι μὲν Σολύμων, νῦν δὲ Ἰσαύρων ὀνομαζομένων; (tr. Price); cf. Chauvot (1986) 121.

⁴ Cf. Mitford (1980) 1234.

⁵ Strabo XIV.5.6. notes: "for since the region was naturally well adapted to the business of piracy both by land and by sea ..." (εὐφροῦς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ τόπου πρὸς τὰ ληστῆρια καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν ...) (tr. Jones), referred to by Hopwood (1983) 173. See also Minor (1979) 118ff.

⁶ On this campaign, see Magic (1950) 1.287–290, with II.1170, n.22 for the contemporary sources, Piganiol (1967) 480, Capizzi (1969) 91, Minor (1979) 119, Mitford (1980) 1235–1236 and Scullard (1982) 97.

67 B.C. The latter cleared the coast of Cilicia Tracheia, winning a decisive battle at Coracesium, the main centre of piratical activity, and reportedly captured one hundred and twenty settlements along the coastline and in the Taurus foothills.⁷ When Anastasius eventually succeeded in suppressing the Isaurians (see below, pp.26–28), he is compared favourably with both Servilius⁸ and Pompey.⁹

Pompey received great acclaim for this victory and his subsequent reorganisation of Cilicia, yet the history of this province is one of shifting boundaries both geographical and political,¹⁰ and continued aggression towards the empire. Periods of relative peace and prosperity always yielded to renewed hostility. Thus, after nearly a century of peace, Isaurian chieftains raided Lycia and Pamphylia which sparked a counter-offensive by the emperor, Marcus Aurelius Probus (A.D. 276–282). He set out against them in 279/280 and the Isaurians surrendered after their rebel leader was killed.¹¹ The second half of the fourth century was plagued by a series of incursions: the Isaurians intercepted shipping on the waters between Cyprus and Asia Minor and ravaged Lycaonia, Cilicia and Pamphylia, reaching, by the beginning of the

⁷ On Pompey's campaign and reorganisation, see e.g. Magie (1950) 375–376 and Capizzi (1969) 91, Seager (1979) chapter 4, Greenhalgh (1980) chapters 6–7, Mitford (1980) 1236–1240, Scullard (1982) 98 and Hill (1996) 4.

⁸ Prisc. *Pan.* 84–86: “Not even Servilius, once ■ most distinguished commander on whom, as deserved praise, the title of Isauricus had been bestowed because of his campaign, was able to accomplish this feat for the Romans” (*quod nec ductorum Servilii optimus olim, / pro merito laudum cui nomen Isauricus illo / Marte datum fuerat, potuit praestare Latinis*) (tr. Coyne).

⁹ *Anthol. Graec.* II.398–406: “Pompey, the leader of the successful Romans in their campaign against the Isaurians, was treading under foot the Isaurian swords... He was the man who was ... the father of the noble race of the Emperor Anastasius” (καὶ πρόμος εὐκαμάτων Πομπήιος Αὔσονιῶν, / πατὴρ ἰσαυροφόνων κειμήλιον ἡγορεύων, / στείβομένης ὑπὸ ποσσὶν Ἰσαυρίδας εἶχε μαχαίρας, ... / κείνος ἀνὴρ, ... ὃς βασιλεὺς / ἡγαθὲν ἐφύτευσεν Ἀναστασίου γενέθλην) (tr. Paton). Prisc. *Pan.* 15–18: “But yet, o Pompey, yield to a known descendant. For the race which you, the conqueror of all the world, left untamed in the high hills of Taurus, this man has defeated, uprooting utterly the seeds of war” (*sed tamen egregio, Pompei, cede nepoti. / namque genus, quod tu, terrarum victor ubique, / indomitum Tauri linquebas collibus altis, / hic domuit penitus convellens semina belli*) (tr. Coyne).

¹⁰ On the fluidity of boundaries, Capizzi (1969) 91 and Mitford (1980) 1239–1241, 1247, 1250–1251. It was under the reorganisation of either Antoninus Pius or Hadrian that the boundary between Cilicia Tracheia and Padias separated the province into two quite distinct regions; the term Cilicia remained associated with the Plains, while Tracheia became known as Isauria (contra Chauvot (1986) 122). For the argument that Isauria “adapted to rather than resisted Greco-Roman cultural and political institutions” in the second century, see Lenski (1999) 431–439.

¹¹ Magie (1950) I.720–721, and Rougé (1966) 285ff, with the *Historia Augusta*, Probus 16.4–17.1 and Zos. I.69–70. For previous trouble during the reign of Gallienus, and on Probus, see Minor (1979) 119–121, Shaw (1990) 237–240 and Lenski (1999) 420–421.

fifth century, Cappadocia and the Pontus.¹² The Isaurians were finally brought to order in 408 by the Armenian general, Arbazacius, who penetrated the mountainous interior of Isauria, destroying fortresses and massacring the population, a stratagem which successfully drew home the Isaurian raiders.¹³

The Balance of Power: Isaurians and Germans

It is from this point that the Isaurians began to enter the arena of imperial politics as the Romans manipulated the ambitions of both Isaurians and Goths. For the first half of the fifth century, between 408 and 441, little is heard of the Isaurians; they were possibly paid a donative.¹⁴ In 441, however, they surfaced again when Marcellinus *Comes* recorded that “the Persians, Saracens, Tzanni, Isaurians and Huns left their own territories and plundered the land of the Romans”.¹⁵ Given their past record and this renewed insurrection, is it not surprising that, in 447, Theodosius II entrusted the defence of the imperial capital against Attila to the Isaurian, Flavius Zeno? But clearly, this rise of the Isaurians coincides with the decline of German influence, which resulted from Theodosius' growing dissatisfaction with German army service. In 441, the Huns easily breached the Danube frontier with no opposition, because Arnegisclus, far from masterminding the Roman defence, was away organising the murder of the Vandal John, the *magister militum per Thracias*.¹⁶ Similarly, in 443, the army commanded by Arnegisclus, Aspar, the powerful *magister militum per Orientem*, and Areobindus was severely defeated in the Chersonese by Hunnic troops.¹⁷ Angered by this incompetence or worse, treachery, and generally tired of the oppressive German presence, Theodosius

¹² See Brooks (1893) 211, Stein (1959) I.141–142, Rougé (1966) 292–299, Minor (1979) 121, Shaw (1990) 240–244 and Lenski (1999) 422–424. On the raids of 359–368, see Ammianus Marcellinus, XIX.13 and XXVII.9.6, and for eye-witness accounts of the Isaurian incursions into Armenia and Cappadocia at the end of the fourth century, see the letters of John Chrysostom who was in exile at this time, *eps.* 13–15. For records of the raiding by region, see Philostorgius XI.8 on Cyprus, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *History of the Monks* X.5 on Syria, and Jerome, *ep.* 114, on Phoenicia and Galilee.

¹³ For further details, Shaw (1990) 425. Lenski (1999) 439–446 draws a distinction between the local small-scale banditry of the first two centuries A.D. and the open rebellion and warfare after the third century.

¹⁴ Cf. Thompson (1946) 19, Lenski (1999) 425.

¹⁵ *Persae, Saraceni, Tzanni, Isauri, Hunni finibus suis egressi Romanorum sola vastaverunt* (tr. Croke). Cf. Prisc. fr.10; Stein (1959) I.291f and Capizzi (1969) 92.

¹⁶ Proc. *de Aed.* IV.5.6 on Attila's attack; John of Ant. fr.206 and the *Chron. Pasch.* 441 on the murder of John. On Arnegisclus, *PLRE* II.151 and John the Vandal, *PLRE* II.597, no.13.

¹⁷ Aspar, *PLRE* II.164–169; Areobindus, *PLRE* II.145–146, no.2.

froze all German promotions and instead rewarded Zeno for his defence of the capital with the consulship in 448. Other Isaurians also gained promotion, while Zeno built up a substantial power base resting on his fellow Isaurians who had accompanied him to Constantinople, on private armies of *bucellarii* and on the imperial troops under his command.¹⁸

It is still unclear, however, why Theodosius II should transfer his favour to the Isaurians in particular, because there is strong evidence for their unpopularity in Constantinople, even during their period of ascendancy.¹⁹ The populace, then, should have been relieved by the accession, in 450, of Marcian, a protégé of Aspar: during the seven years of his reign, Germanic influence was once again predominant. Aspar controlled the government, while his son, Ardaburius, took the post of *magister militum per Orientem*. It is probable that Flavius Zeno died shortly after Marcian's succession.²⁰ Yet, though Isaurian ascendancy had been fairly short-lived, it had provided a welcome alternative to Germanic influence which would not be forgotten. On the other hand, it also provided a striking example of how Isaurians could dominate the empire more effectively from within, rather than as a continual external barbaric threat.

On the death of Marcian, Aspar placed Leo on the throne. But puppet emperors do not always remain loyal to their benefactors and, though Leo was at first willing to submit to the authority of his barbarian patron, he soon sought independence.²¹ He insulted Aspar by giving his daughter Ariadne (promised to Aspar) to a certain Isaurian chieftain, Tarasicodissa of Rousamblada, who at the same time took the office of *comes domesticorum*; Tarasicodissa subsequently changed his name to Zeno, in memory of his famous predecessor.²² As before, the

Isaurians flourished as Germanic power declined, to the extent that the choice of officers selected to lead the ill-fated expedition against the Vandals in 468 completely excluded Aspar and his colleagues. The naval command went to Basiliscus, Leo's brother-in-law, while two Isaurians, Marsus and Heraclius, led the land forces.²³

Ambiguity surrounds the chronology and details of events between 467 and 471 as both the Isaurian and Germanic factions strove for supremacy and influence.²⁴ Zeno held the consulship in 469 and was also appointed *magister militum per Orientem*; in which capacity he went to Isauria, ironically to suppress the brigand, Indacus.²⁵ During his absence, Leo was persuaded to make Patricius, Aspar's unpopular second son, Caesar, and marry him to his younger daughter, Leontia.²⁶ But the former *magister militum per Orientem*, Ardaburius, continued to stir up trouble, this time trying to win over the Isaurians in Constantinople.²⁷ This power struggle continued to 471, when a plot was hatched: Aspar and Ardaburius were slaughtered in the palace and the new Caesar, Patricius, was wounded.²⁸ The Goths, however, remained powerful. One of Aspar's guards, Ostrys, prevented from breaking into the palace by the *excubitores*, went to join Theoderic, son of Triarius, who rose up against the empire.²⁹ After successfully starving Arcadiopolis into submission and threatening the suburbs of Philippopolis, Theoderic was prepared to come to terms. In addition to the "most senior command in the eastern army", he accepted from Leo an annual payment of two thousand pounds of gold.³⁰

(1893) 212, Bury *ibid.*, Stein (1959) I.358 and Capizzi (1969) 93. It is agreed that as Zeno and Ariadne's son, Leo II, was six in 474, the marriage can have taken place no later than 467 (Brooks suggests 466). On Zeno's rise from obscurity, see also Chauvot (1986) 123.

²³ Prisc. fr.53.1, cf. Proc. B.V. III.6.5–25, Theod. Lect. 399, Theoph. AM 5961. Brooks (1893) 213 suggests that it was just after the Vandal disaster that the plan to assassinate Aspar was first formulated.

²⁴ It is not clear, for example, at what point Ardaburius was discovered in treasonable communication with Persia, whether before or after the Isaurians arrived in Constantinople; cf. V. Dan. Styl. 55 and Candid. fr.1, with Stein (1959) I.358 and Baynes (1925) 398–399.

²⁵ Despite formal power in the empire, many natives of Isauria continued in their old customs; V. Dan. Styl. 65.

²⁶ For the details and sources, Brooks (1893) 213–214 and Stein (1959) I.360.

²⁷ Cf. Brooks (1893) 213 and CMH I.470. On the hatred in Constantinople towards these Isaurians, see John of Ant. fr.206.1.

²⁸ Marc. C. 471. See Stein (1959) I.361 on Leo's plot. Hermanric, Aspar's youngest son, was warned by Zeno and escaped to Isauria, where he married a relation of Zeno, Brooks (1893) 214–215.

²⁹ On Ostrys, Brooks (1893) 215 and Stein (1959) I.361. Theoderic's rebellion, Malch. fr. 2 and Brooks (1893) 215, and especially Heather (1991) 264–271.

³⁰ Heather (1991) 269.

¹⁸ See Shaw (1990) 251–252 and Burgess (1992) 875–876 on the identity of the Isaurians in the capital during this period; and, on the Isaurians in the army, Lenski (1999) 426.

¹⁹ There is evidence, even at this early stage, for the distrust of the people of Constantinople for this race; most of the population was not reassured by Zeno's defence of their walls and fled at the sight of the Huns — see Thompson (1946) 23. Zeno almost brought ruin to the empire by interfering in the eunuch Chrysaphius' negotiations with Attila, who then proposed an alliance with Theoderic. See further Thompson (1946) 23–25 with relevant sources, CMH I.467 and Stein (1959) I.298 with references to Prisc. fr.15. It is suggested in Damascius' *Life of Isidore* 290, that the Isaurians brought to the strongly orthodox Constantinople a pagan revival; cf. Thompson (1946) 28–30. Isauria itself, however, was certainly Christianised.

²⁰ Thompson (1946) 30 and Chauvot (1986) 123 speculate from Jord. Rom. 333, that Zeno died in 453. It is possible that he was too unwell in 450 to contest the elevation of his rival's candidate. On Ardaburius, PLRE II.135–137, no.1.

²¹ Cf. Brooks (1893) 210–211, and on the increasingly strained relations between Aspar and Leo, see the CMH I.469f.

²² On the name Tarasicodissa, Bury (1923) I.318. On the marriage and date, Brooks

The Emperor Zeno

This agreement lasted until 474 when Leo I died, leaving the empire in the hands of his grandson Leo II and under the regency of Zeno, the boy's father. The young Leo co-opted Zeno as joint emperor but died only a few months later, leaving Zeno sole emperor of the east. There is copious evidence in the sources of odium and contempt for the Isaurians, particularly exacerbated at this time by the increase of Isaurians in the garrison at Constantinople and their domination of the top posts.³¹ The first impetus for an attempt to overthrow the regime came from within the court. Verina, Leo I's widow, and her brother, Basiliscus, having secured the services of Illus and his brother, Trocundes, tricked Zeno into leaving Constantinople and took control of the city. Basiliscus seized the throne and sent Illus and Trocundes against Zeno who had retreated to his native Isauria.³² However, when they did not receive the agreed payment from the usurping emperor, the brothers changed their allegiance and with Zeno began to march on the capital, entering it in August, 476.³³ Basiliscus and his family were seized and the usurper was later beheaded in Cappadocia. From this point, the story of the Isaurians is dominated by the figure of Illus, the *magister officiorum*, who wielded great influence over the emperor. Though he was ostensibly on Zeno's side, he had taken the precaution of capturing Zeno's brother, Longinus, who was to be used as a pawn over the next few years of uncertainty. It is perhaps not surprising that two assassination attempts were made against Illus; on the second, finding Verina the instigator of the plot, he demanded custody of her from Zeno and sent her to Dalisandus.³⁴

³¹ See esp. Josh. 12, Anon. Val. 40ff, Evag. III.1 and Zon. XIV.1–2, and for an unfavourable portrayal of Zeno, Malch. passim. Illus, the *magister officiorum*, was equally disliked, cf. Bury (1923) I.394 and Stein (1949) II.9. On general animosity towards the Isaurians, Bury (1923) I.389–390, Jones (1964) I.224, Capizzi (1969) 94, Chauvot (1986) 123, Lenski (1999) 427f, and Brooks (1893) 216 who points out that the Romans were now subject to a race which they had unsuccessfully tried to subdue for over five hundred years.

³² Zeno left Constantinople on 9th January, 475. Many Isaurians fled with him; of those who remained, a great number were slaughtered in the anti-Isaurian reaction. For details, Brooks (1893) 216, Bury (1923) I.391, Stein (1959) I.363. On the antagonism between Zeno and Illus, see Shaw (1990) 252–254 and Burgess (1992) 877–879.

³³ Basiliscus had made himself very unpopular on account of his religious policy (he was a monophysite); CMH I.473 and Jones (1964) I.225. His nephew, Armatus, sent to prevent Zeno from entering Constantinople, also changed allegiance (though he was later murdered by those he had helped), Brooks (1893) 218, Bury (1923) I.392–393 and Stein (1959) I.364.

³⁴ Evag. III.27; Brooks (1893) 218–219, CMH I.475, Bury (1923) I.394, Stein (1949) II.10.

Meanwhile, during this intrigue among the Isaurians, the two Gothic Theoderics began to ravage Thrace and Illyrium.³⁵ Zeno at first assumed the command himself, but subsequently changed his mind. Accused of cowardice, it is more likely that he realized that even a partial withdrawal of Isaurian troops from Constantinople would result in a revolt.³⁶ As it happened, such precaution was justified, for while the Theoderics were being coerced into peace,³⁷ there came a second attempt to cast off the unwelcome Isaurian rule. In 479, Marcian, son of the western emperor Anthemius, seeking vengeance for the banished Verina, raised a rebellion in Constantinople.³⁸ He claimed that he was the rightful emperor on the somewhat spurious grounds that his wife, Leontia, had been born while Leo was ruling and Ariadne, the elder, before. He easily gained control of the city, but committed a grave error in delaying his attack on the palace, for it gave Illus the opportunity to bring over relief forces of Isaurians from Chalcedon; and the next day, he crushed the rebellion with a mixture of bribery and fighting. Marcian managed to escape, but was repulsed from Ancyra by Trocundes, and his revolt ended in his imprisonment in Isauria.³⁹ His brother, Procopius, and another leader, Bousalbus, were more successful and escaped to the safe haven of Theoderic, who was in league with Marcian. Theoderic had arrived before the walls of Constantinople rather too late to be of assistance and, finding himself facing a sturdy defence by the Isaurians, pretended that he had come to help Zeno and departed after receiving gifts.⁴⁰

After the revolt of Marcian, there followed a third attempt on Illus' life: during the circus games a blow was struck at his head, cutting off his ear.⁴¹ The plot had been instigated by Ariadne who wanted her mother recalled from Dalisandus.⁴² Illus departed for Antioch, ostensibly to recover, with the official position of *magister militum per Orientem*, but his action in taking his closest supporters was a clear

³⁵ It was thus imperative for Zeno to retain Illus' loyalty at this time. For an overview of relations between Zeno and the two Theoderics, see Heather (1991) 272–293.

³⁶ See Brooks (1893) 219, CMH I.474–475, Bury (1923) I.394–395 and Jones (1964) I.225–227.

³⁷ Theoderic, son of Theodemir, was defeated by the *magister militum* Sabinianus; Theoderic, son of Triarius, was bought off.

³⁸ On the chronology of this rebellion and Verina's banishment, Brooks (1893) 219.

³⁹ Cf. Brooks (1893) 219–221, Bury (1923) I.395 and Jones (1964) I.227.

⁴⁰ Theoderic continued his incursions into Roman territory and even attempted another assault on Constantinople, but subsequently retired to Thrace where he died in a riding accident. His son, Rekitach, who succeeded him, was murdered in 484 by Theoderic (son of Theodemir), who united the two Gothic parties under him.

⁴¹ Mal. 387, Josh. 13, Evag. III.27.

⁴² Mal. 387 with Bury (1923) I.395–396, contra Josh. 13.

indication that war was imminent.⁴³ Both sides then made their final preparations. Illus drummed up support not only from Isauria, but also solicited help from Persia, Roman Armenia and Italy;⁴⁴ while Zeno bought off Theoderic, exiled Illus' friends and bestowed their land on Isaurian cities.⁴⁵

Illus chose Leontius, ironically an envoy sent from Zeno, as emperor⁴⁶ and, with even greater irony, 'legalized' the whole affair with the support of Verina.⁴⁷ She crowned Leontius emperor in Tarsus, and circulated proclamations to Antioch and to the provincial governors of the east and of Egypt, announcing the accession.⁴⁸ Leontius entered Antioch triumphantly on 27th June, 484, and was generally received well elsewhere.⁴⁹ However, Illus' forces were quickly reduced by the imperial troops led by John the Scythian,⁵⁰ and Verina and Illus' other supporters were confined in the Isaurian castle of Papirios where they were either killed by the Romans or perished from natural causes.⁵¹ At some point during the siege Longinus returned to

⁴³ See Brooks (1893) 222–223 on this episode, the dating and a list of supporters who accompanied Illus. It seems that Zeno tried to avert war by giving Illus the task of appointing *duces*, usually undertaken by the emperor; his attention was distracted by Theoderic who was still ravaging Thessaly and Macedonia, and he was concerned for his brother's safety.

⁴⁴ While initially Persia and Roman Armenia agreed and Odoacer refused to help, it was in fact only Odoacer who did send support.

⁴⁵ This last step was part of an ongoing battle between emperor and general to win the support of Isaurians. Later, Illus arranged an annual donative of fourteen hundred pounds of gold (John of Ant. fr.214b, contra Evag. III.35 who gives the figure of five thousand pounds). See Stein (1949) II.30, Capizzi (1969) 94 and Chauvot (1986) 123 on how this was a notable strain on the state budget. On the preparations for war, Josh. 15, Mal. 388, John of Ant. fr.214; Bury (1923) I.396, *CMH* I.477–478, Stein (1949) II.28, and Jones (1964) I.228–229. Zeno dismissed Illus from his position as *magister militum per Orientem* and appointed in his place John the Scythian.

⁴⁶ Eustath. fr.4 and Mal. 388 wrongly make Leontius one of the original rebels, contra Josh. 14 and Jord. *Rom.* 352 where Leontius is Zeno's envoy; cf. Brooks (1893) 225 and Stein (1949) II.28 on the primary sources. The forces sent with Leontius were led by two Isaurians: Conon, son of Fuscian (a bishop of Apameia) and Lingis, a half-brother of Illus.

⁴⁷ Josh. 14, Theod. Lect. 437, John of Ant. fr.214.5. Illus realized that he was too unpopular with the Romans to become emperor himself, but his first choice, the previous usurper Marcian, refused (or Illus subsequently changed his mind).

⁴⁸ For the full text, Brooks (1893) 226. Verina played on Zeno's unpopularity, exacerbated by his promulgation of the *Henoticon*.

⁴⁹ Except at Chalcis and Edessa, Josh. 16. See Stein (1949) II.29 on the new government of Illus and Leontius, and generally *CMH* I.478 and Bury (1923) I.398.

⁵⁰ Evag. III.27, Josh. 17, John of Ant. fr.214.6, Theoph. AM 5977; Stein (1949) II.29. Theoderic was initially sent at the head of a Gothic contingent, but was quickly recalled; perhaps Zeno suspected his loyalty.

⁵¹ Mal. 389, John of Ant. fr.214.6, Josh. 17, Evag. III.27, Theoph. AM 5976 and 5983; *CMH* I.478–479 and Stein (1949) II.30. Illus was left with only a few supporters, having dismissed over two thousand because of the scarcity of provisions and

Constantinople, having either escaped or been released by Illus, who perhaps hoped for more lenient treatment should his coup prove unsuccessful.⁵² After a siege of four years, the defences of the castle were breached, and Illus and Leontius were betrayed by the garrison and executed. Their heads were displayed at Constantinople.⁵³

Anastasius and the Isaurians

Zeno had only three years to enjoy the fruits of his victory. He died in April, 491 and with him perished Isaurian dominance of the empire. The appointment of Anastasius necessarily meant disappointment for Longinus who had hoped to succeed his brother.⁵⁴ It also heralded the fragmentation of the Isaurian powerbase in the capital. For, in the world of late Roman politics, it was essential for those in government opposed to Isaurian dominance to grasp at once the opportunity presented by this fragility and sudden vulnerability. And there was one factor which had altered to the Isaurians' disadvantage: the complete change in the balance of power in the east. Under Theodosius II, Marcian, Leo and even Zeno himself, there was a constant interplay between the Goths and the Isaurians, a constant battle for power and influence at the imperial court. But from 488, the Goths, now in Italy, no longer formed part of the delicately balanced equation, thus reducing or nullifying the need for an Isaurian counterforce. Within a very short space of time, the Isaurians lost both their bargaining power and their imperial influence, and it was not surprising that Anastasius should take his first opportunity to rid the empire of this unpopular

concerns over treachery. Trocundes was killed by imperial troops when out raiding for supplies, while Pamphilius, the pagan who had foretold success for Illus' enterprise, perished at the hands of the rebels themselves when his prophecy proved false. For a description of the castle of Papirios and its impregnability, see Josh. 12 and 17 and Coyne (1991) 110.

⁵² Marc. C. 485, Mal. 386, Theoph. AM 5975. Longinus was appointed *magister militum praesentalis* and held the consulship twice (486 and 490), a position that was not usually filled more than once by someone other than the emperor — a sign that Zeno was priming his brother as his successor.

⁵³ The garrison was not rewarded for its treachery; all the defenders were killed. Marc. C. 488, Mal. 389, Josh. 17, Vict. Tun. 488.2, Theod. Lect. 438, Theoph. AM 5980, and John of Ant. fr.214.6 who is not entirely unsympathetic to the rebels, perhaps because of their orthodoxy. 488 was a successful year for Zeno, as he also managed to rid the eastern empire of the menace of the unpredictable Theoderic and his Gothic hordes, by sending them off to fight Odoacer in Italy.

⁵⁴ Longinus' ambition for the throne, Evag. III.29, Theoph. AM 5983; Stein (1949) II.82, Capizzi (1969) 95, and Brooks (1893) 231 who comments on Longinus' unpopularity and incompetence.

race.⁵⁵ But the magnitude of the task facing the new emperor should not be underestimated. True, valuable lessons from the painful collisions between empire and the ascendant Isaurians were there to be learnt. Yet the difficulty of fighting the Isaurians in their native territory was recognised from Rome's earliest confrontations in the first century B.C. – even Zeno had taken four years to reduce Illus in the mountainous regions – and could not be ignored.

The First Years of Hostilities

Anastasios' initial step was to remove the Isaurians from the arena of imperial power and his opportunity came in the opening months of his reign. Conflicting source evidence obscures the story. It seems that the new emperor accused his unpopular opposition of instigating the riot in the hippodrome, as noted by Marcellinus *Comes*: "Civil strife arose among the Byzantines and most of the city and the hippodrome was engulfed by a blaze".⁵⁶ The riot was ostensibly a protest against the unpopular city prefect, Julian, and Anastasios, though firmly suppressing this insurgence, replaced the prefect with his own brother-in-law, Secundinus.⁵⁷ Was there any foundation for Anastasios' accusation that the Isaurians had any involvement in this riot, or was this merely an excuse for the mass deportation of Isaurians?⁵⁸ John of Antioch's

account is not clear. Whatever the substance behind Anastasios' claims, Zeno's brother, Longinus, was banished, according to some sources, to the Thebaid where he died of starvation eight years later.⁵⁹ Longinus' mother, wife and daughter were exiled to the Bithynian coast where they were forced to subsist on charity.⁶⁰ Longinus of Kardala, the *magister officiorum* (484–491), was also expelled, his case not helped by his ardent support of his namesake's claim to the throne.⁶¹ Another prominent Isaurian, the senator Athenodorus, also found himself ousted from the capital.⁶² Discrepancy in the sources conceals whether Anastasios expelled all the Isaurians in the capital, or whether they left of their own accord, fearing that with no influence a massacre such as that under Basiliscus might follow.⁶³ At the same time, Anastasios also imposed other penalties on the Isaurians. He withdrew the annual donation introduced by Illus in 484, which Zeno had continued,⁶⁴ all Isaurian property was confiscated, including the imperial robes which were put up for auction,⁶⁵ and the castle of Papirios was destroyed.

On their arrival back in Isauria, the banished Isaurian leaders joined their compatriots, who had started a revolt at the announcement of Anastasios' accession.⁶⁶ This rebellion was led by Conon, the

the 491, not 493, riot. See further, Brooks (1893) 233, and noted by Mommsen (1872) 340.

⁵⁹ John of Ant. fr.214b, Zon. XIV.3.20, contra Theoph. AM 5984, who records that Longinus was exiled to Alexandria where he was ordained a priest and died seven years later.

⁶⁰ John of Ant. fr.214b, Evag. III.29.

⁶¹ It is important to distinguish Longinus of Kardala from Longinus, Zeno's brother, as Evagrius III.29 (and Niceph. Call. XVI.36) fails to do, cf. *PLRE* II.688 and Allen (1981) 144 on how this error leads to much confusion in Evagrius' subsequent section on the Isaurian war at III.35. On Longinus of Kardala, see Theoph. AM 5983–5984 and Coyne (1991) 65.

⁶² John of Ant. fr. 214b and Theoph. AM 5987–5988. John of Antioch mentions a second Athenodorus, calling him "the other Athenodorus" ("ἄλλο Αἰθηνόδορον τοῦ ἑτέρου) to distinguish him. Evag. III.35 conflates the two Athenodori, and calls the one figure Theodorus, a mistake noted by Bury (1923) I.433, Allen (1981) 155, and Whitby (2000) 180. Thus, at the end of the war, Evagrius has the heads of Longinus, Zeno's brother, and Theodorus being sent to Constantinople, when he means Longinus of Kardala and the two Athenodori.

⁶³ Theoph. AM. 5985 — Anastasios expelled the Isaurians because of their crimes, contra Evag. III.29 (following Eustath. fr.5) the Isaurians left at their own request, cf. Coyne (1991) 96.

⁶⁴ Presumably, this was the fourteen hundred (or five thousand) pounds of gold, although Jord. *Rom.* 354–355 reported that this was not the sum in question but an additional payment given by Zeno after the defeat of Illus.

⁶⁵ Cf. John of Ant. fr.214b. The withdrawal of the Isaurian donative and the money raised from the confiscations and auction would have been used to sustain the war against the Isaurians; Stein (1949) II.83.

⁶⁶ It is clear from the account of John of Antioch (fr.214b) that the revolt in Isauria broke out immediately after the emperor's accession, before the riot and subsequent

⁵⁵ We have seen plenty of evidence of the ill will felt towards the Isaurians in Constantinople, e.g. Josh. *passim*. See also Prisc. *Pan.* 19–37, and Proc. *Pan.* 9, on their pillaging and insolence before Anastasios became emperor. This is not, for once, mere panegyric rhetoric, as Josh., Zach. of Myt. VII.2 and Georg. Mon. 624 all comment on the Isaurians' unruly behaviour at the beginning of Anastasios' reign; cf. Vasiliev (1932) I.140 and Chauvot (1986) 123.

⁵⁶ *Bellum plebeium inter Byzantios ortum parsque urbis plurima atque circi igne combusta*. Marc. C. 491 (tr. Croke). John of Ant. fr.214b links this riot to the expulsion of the Isaurians, contra Mal. 393–395 and Marc. C. who do not mention the connection. Theoph. AM 5985 refers to the "many outrages" committed by the Isaurians, possibly referring to their part in this riot.

⁵⁷ Cf. ch. 6, pp.225–226.

⁵⁸ Brooks (1893) 232 wrongly believes this riot was provoked by religious discontent, cf. ch. 6, pp.225–226. There is no evidence that the Isaurians were strongly Chalcedonian orthodox, or indeed that the people of Constantinople preferred Chalcedonian Isaurians to the monophysite Anastasios; see Bréhier (1914) col.1449. Brooks is also unnecessarily concerned that Bury (1923) I.432–433 (who followed an account by A. Rose, *Kaiser Anastasios I*, Dissert. Halle-Wittenberg 1892) is associating the expulsion with the riot of 493 (not 491). However, it does seem clear that Bury was referring to the 491 riot and closely follows the account of John of Antioch. The confusion arises because Marcellinus *Comes*, in his description of the 491 riot, does not mention that the imperial statues were pulled down, as reported by John of Antioch. This is not a significant omission, however, as such vandalism was a common feature of city riots; the burning of the circus, on the other hand, also mentioned by John of Antioch, which is much rarer, is connected by Marcellinus with

ex-bishop of Apameia,⁶⁷ and Lilingis, the *comes et praeses Isauriae*.⁶⁸ Their forces, combined with those of Longinus of Kardala and Athenodorus, totalled up to one hundred and fifty thousand, and they had access to supplies and arms in a store originally established by Zeno.⁶⁹

These generals now masterminded a series of offensive strikes, before advancing to Cotyaeum in Phrygia.⁷⁰ Here, they were met by the imperial forces led by the experienced John the Scythian, the *magister militum per Orientem* (483–498), and John the Hunchback, who succeeded Zeno's brother, Longinus, as *magister militum praesentalis* (492–499).⁷¹ Also holding high commands were Justin, the future emperor, the Gothic Apskal, Sigizan and Zolbo at the head of the Hunnic forces, and Diogenianus.⁷² Though the imperial army apparently numbered only two thousand, the Isaurians, who were not used to fighting on open battlefields, were defeated, and Lilingis was killed.⁷³

banishment of Isaurians from the capital; cf. Bury (1923) I.432, Stein (1949) II.83 and Jones (1964) I.230, contra Croke (1995) 107 who seems to suggest that inhabitants of Isauria revolted as a result of the exile of their countrymen from Constantinople. Prisc. *Pan.* 52–60 also reverses the events, cf. Chauvot (1986) 126. The only problem visualised by Brooks (1893) 233 in accepting that the revolt broke out in Isauria immediately after Longinus' failure to accede to the throne, is how the castle of Papirios could be destroyed, as described by John of Antioch, if the Isaurians were already in a state of rebellion. However, the *CMH* I.479, suggests that the castle was demolished before the rebels had a chance to reoccupy it.

⁶⁷ John of Ant. fr.214b, *PLRE* II.306f, Conon 4, Stein (1949) II.83 and Capizzi (1969) 97.

⁶⁸ Lilingis was the half-brother of Illus (*PLRE* II.683) referred to as "Longinines the lame" (Λογγινίνην τὸν χωλόν) by Mal. 393, "Lilingis, slow on foot" (*Lilingis, segnis quidem pede*), by Marc. C. 492, Nilingis (Νιλιγγίς) by Theoph. and Lingis (Λίγγις) by the *Souda* s.v. *Lingis* 501. See Müller (1870) 30, n.5 and Mommsen (1872) 342 for detailed discussions, contra Brooks (1893) 231 who argues against the identification made by Bury, Rose, Mommsen and Müller of this figure with Lingis, commander in the war against Illus. Allen (1981) 155 points out that Evagrius mistakenly calls Lingis, Indes.

⁶⁹ Theoph. AM 5985 gives the figure one hundred and fifty thousand, cf. John of Ant. fr.214b, who gives one hundred thousand. Both sums are probably exaggerated, designed to emphasise the success of the imperial troops, cf. Stein (1949) II.83. The forces included Isaurians and Romans, both voluntary and those under compulsion. Chauvot (1986) 127 suggests that the volunteer Romans would rather fight for pagan Isaurians than a monophysite emperor. However, as previously discussed, Isauria had been Christianised, and there was still little religious trouble at this stage of the reign.

⁷⁰ Proc. *Pan.* 9, Theoph. AM 5985, Zon. XIV.3.22. Capizzi (1969) 98 suggests that Constantinople was their ultimate goal.

⁷¹ *PLRE* II.617–618, John (the Hunchback) 93. On both Johns, Theod. Lect. 449, John of Ant. fr.214b, contra Theoph. AM 5985 with Mango and Scott (1997) 212, n.9.

⁷² Cf. *PLRE* II.649, Justin 4 suggests that Justin held the rank of *comes rei militaris*. Diogenianus is present in the account of Theophanes AM 5985–5986 under the name of Diogenes. He was said to be a kinsman of Ariadne, Mal. *de insid.* 37, *PLRE* II.362, Diogenianus 4.

⁷³ The small figure of two thousand for the imperial troops, given by John of Antioch, is

The Isaurians fled, taking refuge in their strongholds among the Taurus mountains, thus creating the same problem as that faced by the imperial army under Zeno.

In 493, Diogenianus besieged the Isaurian city of Claudopolis on the Calycadnus, but was in turn blockaded by the Isaurians who came down from the mountains and surrounded the imperial forces to the point of starvation. They were rescued, however, by John the Hunchback, who forced the mountain passes and mounted a sudden attack. In the ensuing battle, the ex-bishop Conon was fatally wounded.⁷⁴ After this second defeat, the rebels did not risk another open battle, but confined their activity to guerilla warfare in the mountains. They were supported by the Isaurian, Longinus of Selinus, who smuggled in food supplies via the sea port of Antioch, close to Selinus.⁷⁵

Meanwhile, back in the capital, Anastasius could not rely on the uncertain outcome of a time-consuming war fought in territory so clearly advantageous to the enemy. An anecdote in the history of the downfall of the patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemius, reveals that Anastasius began negotiations with the Isaurians which involved the patriarch.⁷⁶ Euphemius passed on the information to John, the patrician, and father-in-law of Athenodorus, who in turn notified the emperor of his patriarch's indiscretion. A couple of assassination attempts were then made against Euphemius, from both of which he escaped unharmed.

surely another exaggeration to highlight imperial success; cf. Brooks (1893) 234 and Bury (1923) I.433. On the battle of Cotyaeum, see Marc. C. 492, Mal. 393–394, John of Ant. fr.214b, Jord. *Rom.* 355, Theod. Lect. 449, Evag. III.35, and Theoph. AM 5985. On the dating of the battle, Brooks (1893) 234 discusses whether it took place during the winter at the beginning or end of 492. It is not dated precisely in any of the sources, but it is clear from the account of Marcellinus *Comes*, who places it in the fifteenth indiction, that the battle should be assigned to the beginning of 492 (or the very end of 491), contra Theoph. AM 5985 who refers to the winter months at the end of 492. Mommsen (1872) 340ff follows the chronology of Theophanes who starts the war a whole year later, but it seems preferable to follow the sixth-century Marcellinus, rather than the ninth-century Theophanes.

⁷⁴ Mal. 394 records Conon's death by spear; Theoph. AM 5986.

⁷⁵ On this smuggling, Brooks (1893) 235 and Stein (1949) II.84. Prisc. *Pan.* 103–117 emphasises the eventual destruction of the fleet used by Longinus in this enterprise: "Why shall I mention the storms which arose at sea and the enemy fleet wrecked on the Lycian shore?" (*quid tempestates memorabo fluctibus ortas, / atque hostis Lyciae proiectas litore classis*, lines 107–108) (tr. Coyne).

⁷⁶ Theod. Lect. 449f, Theoph. AM 5987 and Georg. Mon. 624–625. Brooks (1893) 235 briefly mentions this episode, but see ch. 5, pp.136–139.

Victory for Anastasius

The Isaurians held out in their mountain strongholds for the following four to five years. Again, difficulty in reconciling divergent sources blurs both events and dating.⁷⁷ The first breakthrough for the imperial army came in 497 when John the Scythian besieged and finally captured Longinus of Kardala⁷⁸ and at least one and probably both of the Athenodori.⁷⁹ Victory celebrations followed. John sent the heads of Longinus and one Athenodorus to the emperor who paraded them impaled on poles, while the head of the other Athenodorus was displayed at Tarsus.⁸⁰ In recognition of his services, John the Scythian held the consulship in 498. In this year, the round-up of the remaining chief Isaurians continued under the command of his colleague, John the Hunchback, who was also rewarded for his success with the consulship in 499. Longinus of Selinus was captured at Antioch-on-the-Cragus by Priscus, an officer on John's staff.⁸¹ He and another prominent rebel, Indes,⁸² were sent to Constantinople where further celebrations were held: the defeated enemies were led through the streets and displayed for ridicule at chariot races.⁸³ Longinus was subsequently sent to Nicaea where he was tortured and beheaded.⁸⁴

⁷⁷ There are discrepancies in the sources over the length of the war. Marc. C. states in his entry for 492 that the war would last for six years. Theod. Lect. 449 merely reports that the war continued for at least five years, that is, to 497, and does not say anything about how the rebels were dealt with, cf. Capizzi (1969) 99, who comments on Theodore's vagueness. Vict. Tun. places the deaths of Athenodorus and Longinus in 495 which is obviously far too early, cf. Clinton (1845) 712. Theoph. AM 5985 says that the war ended three years after the battle of Cotyaeum, again too early. He also wrongly conflates the actions of the two Johns into one offensive (AM 5988).

⁷⁸ Evag. III.35 and Theoph. AM 5988.

⁷⁹ Mal. 394, Marc. C. 497, Vict. Tun. 495, Theod. Lect. 449, Theoph. AM 5988.

⁸⁰ The best way of reconciling the account of Marc. C. which states that Athenodorus' head was displayed at Tarsus and the account of Theoph. which reports that Athenodorus' head was impaled on a pole at Constantinople, is to suggest that both the Athenodori were captured and beheaded in this year, cf. CMH I.480, Capizzi (1969) 98–99 and Chauvot (1986) 127. Marc. C. is the only source for the head of one Athenodorus being displayed at Tarsus.

⁸¹ Marc. C. 498 and Theoph. AM 5988. Marc. C. is the only source to mention the involvement of Priscus, cf. CMH I.480 and Capizzi (1969) 99.

⁸² Named as one of the leading rebels at the end of the conflict, by Mal. *de insid.* 37, Eustath. fr.6, and Evag. III.35, cf. PLRE II.591.

⁸³ On the spectacle in the hippodrome, see Evag. III.35, (Niceph. Call. XVI.36) and Prisc. Pan. 171–173: "This very place rightly displayed trophies to you and offered to view the fettered and defeated tyrants who were driven to your feet in the middle of the Circus spectacles" (*ipse locus vobis ostendit iure tropaea, / obtulit ei victos oculis domitosque tyrannos / ante pedes vestros mediis circensibus actos*) (tr. Coyne).

Chauvot (1986) 127 suggests that this was a publicity stunt to regain popularity for the emperor, although again it seems that Chauvot is ascribing to Anastasius' early years the unpopularity he suffered later in his reign. Moreover, triumphal processions

After the end of the war, many Isaurians were exiled to Thrace where they could be useful in fighting the barbarians who made frequent incursions across the Danube, and where they were near enough to Constantinople to assist in any defence of the city, if necessary. The remaining Isaurian strongholds were now destroyed.⁸⁵ Thus ended the period of Isaurian dominance; thereafter they played no further role in politics, but rather served Rome fighting in the army,⁸⁶ and there is no mention of further rebellion in our sources for the sixth century.⁸⁷ Having served their purpose in providing a counterbalance to

after an imperial victory were the norm; Allen (1981) 155 states that the displaying of the enemies' heads on poles was common practice.

⁸⁴ Marc. C. 498, Evag. III.35 and Theoph. AM 5988.

⁸⁵ Mal. 393, Josh. 23, Marc. C. 498, Prisc. Pan. 119ff, Proc. Pan. 10, Theoph. AM 5988. As the Isaurians were probably settled on the waste-lands of Thrace, Procopius is rather generous to Anastasius in asserting that they were given a city, specially built for them, and rich territory (... πόλιν ἐδίδου, ἣν αὐτοὶ ἐδημιουργήσας, καὶ χώραν εὐδαίμονα, ...), cf. Coyne (1991) 120. Capizzi (1969) 99–100 suggests that settled among the hostile population of Thracians, Anastasius may have expected the numbers of Isaurians to conveniently decline, eventually leading to their total extinction. The CMH I.480 does not go as far as to see this as part of the emperor's plan, but remarks that after two wars and the deportation of thousands of Isaurians to Thrace, the population of Isauria would certainly have been reduced and the neighbouring provinces of Isauria freed from the continual plunder they had previously suffered. See also Vasiliev (1932) I.140, Jones (1964) I.230, Lenski (1999) 429 contra Shaw (1990) 255–256 who disagrees that Isauria itself was pacified and sees no evidence for the destruction of strongholds and the exodus of the population, despite the primary sources. On the other hand, Lenski is probably exaggerating when he talks of the "decimation" of Isaurian cities and the "vast numbers" of Isaurians settled outside the province; clearly life continued with some degree of normality. In the sixth century, there were at least thirteen known bishops (Frend (1981) and there is evidence of continued building work.

⁸⁶ They served Anastasius faithfully in his war against the rebel, Vitalian. We also find mention of them in Justinian's armies; for example, three thousand are reported in action in Sicily, cf. Proc. B.G. V.5.2ff, Stein (1949) II.339–340 and Elton (2000) 298–299. They twice, however, betrayed the army: on December 17th 546, four Isaurians opened the Asinarian Gate, aiding Totila's first capture of Rome, see Proc. B.G. VII.20.4–16, with Bury (1923) II.242 and Stein (1949) II.584; and again, on January 16th 550, Isaurians opened the Porta Ostiensis, thus helping Totila's second capture of Rome, see Proc. B.G. VII.36.7–14 with Bury (1923) II.250 and Stein (1949) II.593. On the other hand, Totila was disappointed in the loyalty of the one thousand strong Isaurian garrison at Naples which refused to betray the city to him, cf. Proc. B.G. VII.6.2 and Stein (1949) II.573. Brooks (1893) 237 reports that the *Souda* mentions an Isaurian revolt at the time of Heraclius, but there is no other source evidence. The Isaurians who remained in their native land and who were now deprived of their traditional livelihood, i.e. brigandage, turned to casual building work, cf. Mango (1966) 363. Theoph. AM 6051 describes Isaurians working at St. Sophia. Hill (1996) 8 and Elton (2000) 299–300 argue that, with the change of emperor and the ensuing hardship as a result of the war, many Isaurians were forced to look for casual labour on Anastasius' building projects: for example, at Dara.

⁸⁷ Lenski (1999) 429–30 argues against Shaw's proposal (1990) 225–259 that Justinian's *Novels* against brigandage in the area necessarily meant that Isauria was still

the dominant Gothic power, the Isaurians found to their cost that they could only capitalise to a limited extent on this need for a counterforce. Constantinople would not tolerate another Isaurian succession to the imperial throne. Zeno's rule had seriously weakened Roman imperium. Neglect of the empire's economy and infrastructure, inability to deal decisively with the Goths, and determination to stave off internal threats had characterised the reign of Zeno. No wonder there was relief when there finally came to the throne a man who was neither Isaurian by birth, nor the puppet of a Gothic general. And Anastasius, approaching his late 60s, could enjoy the fruits of a popular victory achieved by the skilled campaigning of his two *magistri militum*.⁸⁸ Triumphant celebrations in two successive years marked the imperial success before emperor and government settled down to the business of running the state; restoring the fortunes of the empire; and securing its boundaries against a new threat now mounting in the east: the rise of the Persian king, Kavadh.

unpacified. These measures were part of a general scheme to reorganise provincial government and were not aimed specifically at Isauria.

⁸⁸ It is therefore not surprising that the victory over the Isaurians is celebrated in the literature of this period, thus Proc. *Pan.* 9–10, and Prisc. *Pan.* 10–129 who stresses the clemency of Anastasius. There are many references to Anastasius' Isaurian war; for example, in *Anthol. Graec.* II.405–406, IX.210.10 and IX.656.19. Christodorus wrote an *Isaurica* which is no longer extant.

3


EASTERN FOREIGN POLICY

In August, 502 the Great King of Persia, Kavadh, leading an army of Persians, Arabs and Huns, crossed his border into Roman Armenia. The fortified city of Theodosiopolis fell with little resistance as did a succession of Roman towns, until Kavadh's advance was halted by the bravery of the townspeople of Amida who conducted their own defence. This invasion was not unexpected, yet the Persians found Roman defences in disrepair and faced only civilian opposition. This lack of military preparation on the part of Anastasius has often been regarded as woeful negligence from an elderly emperor who had no known military experience. Closer inspection, however, reveals that underlying the usual dramatic accounts of the burning and plundering of cities and the seizure of thousands from the countryside in Arab raids, there was a deep investment by Anastasius in military, economic and religious policy in an effort to improve the finances and security of the empire in the event of a Persian attack.

Relations with Arab tribes: military negotiations, religious affiliation and economic policy

Anastasius' first priority was to ensure military support from the Arab tribes close to the Roman frontier. By the end of the fifth century, the fortifications of the Diocletianic system of defence had been abandoned and many troops had been withdrawn to more threatened borders. Although some *duces*, *limitanei* and imperial soldiers could still be found, regional security was increasingly left to Arab *foederati*, especially along the south-east frontier.¹ Consequently, the Arabs

¹ On the *limes Arabicus*, Parker (1980) 865. For a more detailed account of the policing of the Arab borders by Arab *foederati*, see Parker (1986b) 149–151. For the decline in frontier security, see Devreesse (1942) 270–273 and Capizzi (1969) 177ff.



often played an important role in Romano-Persian relations.² In the 421–422 war, they had intervened in support of the Persian cause, and there are records of many Arab raids against Rome throughout the fifth century.³ Anastasius himself had first-hand experience of the consequences of allowing Persia the opportunity to cultivate Arab alliances, for earlier in his own reign there had been a certain amount of manipulation of Arab allegiance by the Persians. In 491/492, taking advantage of potential weakness in the Roman empire at a time of transition of power, the Arabs are reported to have invaded Phoenicia Libanensis, reaching as far as Emesa.⁴ This was a time when Kavadh was seeking financial assistance from the Romans but was refused, and it is highly likely that the Arab incursion was conducted by the Lakhmids on behalf of their patron kingdom: to indicate Persian displeasure but at the same time, seemingly to maintain Kavadh's truce with the empire.⁵

For further salutary examples, Anastasius could also look to 498 when, according to Theophanes, there was an invasion by three Arab groups.⁶ The first concerned tented Arabs who entered Euphratensis, but were defeated at Bithrapsa by the Roman commander, Eugenius.⁷ These tented Arabs are described as allies of Persia, under the Lakhmid, al-Numan. It is unlikely that Anastasius in any way directly provoked this incursion. The initiative came from Kavadh who, recently restored to the Persian throne and anxious to assert his authority, demanded money from Anastasius and showed his displeasure at the emperor's refusal with a display of military force from his clients.

² Vasiliev (1956) 306–9, Peters (1977–78) 97ff. Malchus notes that at the time of Theodosius (probably 421/422) it was agreed that Rome and Persia would not accept each other's allies; cf. Letsios (1989) 526–527.


³ Cf. Shahid (1989) 37–38, 55ff.

⁴ Cyril of Scyth. *Vit. Abrah.* I; cf. Fowden (1999) 63.

⁵ Josh. 23; cf. Shahid (1989) 120, Fowden (1999) 63–64.

⁶ Theoph. AM. 5990, and Evag. III.36. See Shahid (1989) 121 and 125–129 for the operations of the other two Arab groups, and Fowden (1999) 63 for Kavadh's role.

⁷ *PLRE* II.417, Eugenius 5. Shahid (1989) 121ff gives a detailed account of this invasion. See also Greatrex (1998) 78, with n.20, and Fowden (1999) 61ff who points out the frequent identification of Bithrapsa as Resafa/Sergiopolis (contra Greatrex (2002) 260, n.93). She suggests that, while the rich shrine of S. Sergius would have made an inviting target for plunder, such an assault indicated a change in the tactics of invading Persians and Arabs whose incursions normally followed a route further to the north across the Syrian/Mesopotamian plain just south of the Taurus mountains towards Antioch. It may be that the assault against this Christian holy place points explicitly to the work of a strictly Zoroastrian king anxious to clear himself from any suspicion of Mazdakism; cf. Shahid (1989) 124–125.



In the fifth century, the threat posed by the Germanic tribes had encouraged the Romans both to seek peace on their border with Persia and to create a stable front on the Arab peninsula. To this end, the Salihids, in the role of *symmachoi*, became guardians of Roman interests on this border. They were ideally placed to protect the commercial interests of the Romans, who were seeking new outlets for trade in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean,⁸ and as orthodox Christians, they were more acceptable than the Arian Germans. With the turn of the century, however, this agreement came to an end, and a treaty was struck in 502 in which the Salihids were replaced as Rome's allies. The problem is the identity of the tribe or the tribal leaders with whom Anastasius made the new treaty. This *foedus* is mentioned in several sources, but none offer a precise identification. Eustathius of Epiphania simply says that ■ treaty was made with οἱ Σκηνῖται βάρβαροι (Skenite Arabs), as does Evagrius.⁹ More explicit, although conflicting, information is presented in the accounts of Theophanes and Nonnosus, who suggest that it was the Kindite tribe with whom Anastasius made the treaty, and two Arabic historians, Ya'qūbī and Ibn Khaldūn (quoting Ibn-al-Kalbī), who suggest that it was the Ghassanid tribe. Taking the evidence of all these sources into consideration, as outlined below, it is possible to argue that Anastasius concluded a treaty with both the Kindites and the Ghassanids in 502.

The account of Theophanes reads as follows: "In this year Anastasius made a treaty with Arethas (known as the son of Thalabane), the father of Badicharimos and Ogaros ...", and Nonnosus mentions that his grandfather had been sent by Anastasius to negotiate with Arethas, the phylarch of the Saracens.¹⁰ The most plausible identification for this Arethas is that he was leader of the Kindites who controlled a vast kingdom in central Arabia and whose allegiance would certainly be of no small significance to whichever empire could win it.¹¹ It is known that, at the end of the fifth century, the Kindite kingdom was ruled by al-Harith (Arethas),¹² and that after a number of raids in the area of Syria, Palestine and Phoenicia by Ogaros in 497 and Badicharimos in 501, Anastasius was able to conclude a peace treaty in 502 with their

⁸ The Germans now dominated the western Mediterranean.

⁹ Evag. III.36 with Whitby (2000) 181, n.138.

¹⁰ τοῦτ' αὖ ἔπει σπένδεται πρὸς Ἀρέθαν ὁ Ἄναστάσιος, τὸν Βαδихαρίμου καὶ Ὠγάρου πατέρα, τὸν τῆς Θαλαβάνης λεγόμενον ... Theoph. AM 5995 (tr. Mango and Scott), though for a reconstruction of this text, see below, n.19; Nonnosus *FHG* IV, 179.

¹¹ Robin (1996) 665ff; on the history of the Kindites and their high dependence on the Himyarite kingdom, *passim* and especially 692f.

¹² Cf. Robin (1996) 668, n.18.

father, Arethas, who remained a loyal ally of Rome until his death in 528.

Acceptance of the evidence for this treaty between Anastasius and the Kindites in 502 does not necessarily rule out the possibility of a second treaty with the Ghassanids, supported by the evidence of Ya'qūbī and Ibn Khaldūn. It is known that this period saw the advent and increasing dominance of the Ghassanid tribe. As part of an agreement with the Salīhids to settle on Roman *limes*, the Ghassanids agreed to pay tribute to Rome and to become orthodox Christian (if not already so)¹³. The matter of tribute, however, was to cause problems, as was noted by Ya'qūbī: "Then there arose between them and the king of Rome ■ dispute about the tribute which the king of Rome took. Consequently a man of Ghassan called Jidh' struck one of the friends of the king of Rome with his sword and killed him".¹⁴ Ya'qūbī goes on to describe the ensuing war, as does Theophanes, who records that Romanus, the *dux* of Palestine, conducted a series of operations against the Arabs who had attacked along the whole frontier, and defeated Jabalah, the Ghassanid chief. What had been essentially a local disagreement about tax between two Arab tribes came to attract the attention of the imperial government in Constantinople precisely because of the identity of the tribes involved and the timing of the dispute. The Romans had supported the Salīhids as protectors of the Arab border and their trade route, but at a time when war was breaking out on the eastern front, the advantage to Anastasius of an alliance with the new and powerful tribe of Ghassanids must have been clear.¹⁵ Evidence for the inclusion of the Ghassanids in the treaty is provided by Ya'qūbī and Ibn Khaldūn. Ya'qūbī described how, "when the king of Rome saw their endurance in battle and their resistance to his troops, he disliked that there should be any loss against them, and the people (of Ghassan) asked for peace on the basis that there should be no king over them from the outside, and the king of Rome assented to that and he appointed as king over them Jafnal son of 'Ulayya son of 'Amr son of 'Amr. The relationship between them (Ghassan) and Rome became established and their affairs became one".¹⁶ Ibn-al-Kalbī, quoted by Ibn Khaldūn, reported that the Ghassanids won a victory over the Salīhids

and "this happened during a period of hostilities between Rome and Persia, and the king of the Romans feared lest they should join hands with Persia against him, and so he wrote to them and tried to draw them to his side. Their chief at that time was Tha'laba Ibn 'Amr ... And the two parties entered into an agreement ...".¹⁷ The agreement was one of mutual assistance; the Romans would provide forty thousand troops in times of need, and the Ghassanids, twenty thousand.¹⁸

Finally, to support the argument for the inclusion of the Ghassanids in the 502 treaty, there is a suggestion that the evidence from Theophanes concerning Anastasius' treaty with one Arethas, identified as the son of Thalabane and the father of Ogaros and Badicharimos, is not secure. It has been argued that the text of Theophanes involved a haplography and should be reconstructed thus:

In this year Anastasius concluded a treaty with Arethas the father of Badicharimos and Ogaros and Arethas known as son of the Thalabane ...¹⁹

Given that there is sound evidence for the connection of the name Tha'laba (cf. Thalabane) with the Ghassanids,²⁰ this would allow for Anastasius making a treaty with two Arethases: the Kindite Arethas, father of Badicharimos and Ogaros, and the Ghassanid Arethas, son of Tha'laba and father of Jabalah.²¹

¹⁷ Ibn Khaldūn (quoting Ibn-al-Kalbī) II.279–280, quoted by Kavar (1958a) 238–239. He argues that the period referred to cannot be during the reign of Zeno, as there was no war at that time, and prefers the period of the Anastasian war of 502–506 to the later outbreak of hostilities under Justinian in 529.

¹⁸ In another account of the *foedus* found in the text of Ibn Habīb (a fuller version of the Hishām al-Kalbī history), Anastasius promised military aid to the Ghassanids, "on condition that you will not interfere between us and Persia". This seems to indicate the neutrality of the Arabs and it is possible that Anastasius was only concerned to ensure their impartiality before he embarked on a war with Persia. However, future developments (for example, the attack of the Tha'labites against al-Hira and the support given by a certain al-Aswad to Areobindus against the Sassanians) surely belie the truth of this statement: either this account of the *foedus* is incorrect, or participation on the battlefield was a later arrangement. For the text of Ibn Habīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, ed. I. Lichtenstädter, Hyderabad (1942) 371–372, quoted by Shahīd (1995) 8–9. For further details concerning the treaty, see Trombley and Watt (2000) 69, n.327.

¹⁹ τοῦτω τῷ ἔτει σπένδεται πρὸς Ἀρέθαν ὁ Ἀναστάσιος, τὸν Βαδισχάριμου καὶ Ὠγάρου πατέρα <καὶ (πρὸς) Ἀρέθαν> τὸν τῆς Θαλαβάνης λεγόμενον, Theoph. AM 5995 with Shahīd (1995) 6.

²⁰ Cf. Ibn Khaldūn (quoting Ibn-al-Kalbī) II.279–280, quoted above, who noted that the Ghassanid chief at that time was Tha'laba Ibn 'Amr. It should be noted that the Tha'labites fought for the Roman cause during the Persian war: "The Roman Tayyaye [Arabs of Roman territory], who are called the Tha'labites, went towards Hirta (the residence) of al-Numan, and came across a caravan going up to him ... they attacked and destroyed them, and seized the camels ..." Josh. 57 (tr. Trombley and Watt).

²¹ This is the view of Shahīd, most recently expressed (1995) 1ff and followed by Trombley and Watt (2000) 69, n.327 and Greatrex (1998) 28, n.82 and 99, but now

¹³ Cf. Ya'qūbī, *Historiae* (tr. Hoyland (2001) 333). For the dating of the Ghassanids' arrival on the *limes*, Kavar (1958b) 146ff; generally on the Ghassanids, Fowden (1999) 142.

¹⁴ Ya'qūbī, *Historiae*, I.235 (tr. Hoyland (2001) 335).

¹⁵ Sartre (1982b) 159 points out that the 498 incursions of various Arab tribes demonstrate the inefficiency of the Salīhids in protecting their ally, Rome, from these violations.

¹⁶ Tr. Hoyland (2001) 335.

It is clear then that there are strong arguments to support the suggestion that Anastasius sought alliance with both the Kindites and Ghassanids at the beginning of the sixth century. It is indeed the inclusion of both tribes which would make the most sense for Anastasius' diplomatic policy for the eastern front; that he would forge an alliance with the old and powerful Kindite tribe and with the new dominant Ghassanids who could then displace the Salihids who had proved themselves ineffectual protectors of Roman interests.²²

Anastasius' diplomatic efforts did not end here. He sought to encourage the loyalty of his new allies with their cultural and religious assimilation into the empire. Emphasising common ground in theological matters was as much a tool in gaining allies and cultivating a sense of belonging as the terms of any treaty.²³ It appears that the Ghassanids had converted to Christianity as part of their deal to settle on the *limes*, and it is assumed that the Kindites converted with the signing of the 502 treaty, if they were not already Christian.²⁴ It is likely that both the Ghassanids and Kindites were Chalcedonian as Anastasius himself was not yet openly monophysite, but while the Kindites in Palestina Prima probably stayed Chalcedonian under the sway of Elias, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and St. Sabas,²⁵ the Ghassanids seem to have

also (2002) 260, n.91; cf. Luther (1997) 189–190. Shahid rejects the argument of those such as Rothstein (1899) 90–92 and Olinder (1927) 52–53 who associate the Tha'labites with the Kindites. Their view, however, is upheld by Robin (1996) 698 who disputes the identification of the *banū Tha'laba* with the Jafnids, the ruling élite of the Ghassanids (n.118), arguing *inter alia* that Theophanes does not mention any relationship between Jabalah (the Ghassanid king) and the Tha'labite Arethas when they were both ravaging Roman territory in 497/8. Robin is followed by Whitton (1999) 207, 212f but see *Byzantinische Forschungen* (2000) 135 for Shahid's defence of his position.

²² The vagueness of the accounts of Eustathius and Evagrius who mention the Skenite Arabs in general allow for this interpretation. We need not be surprised that Nonnosus' report which specifically alluded to the embassy of his grandfather to Arethas does not mention the Ghassanids. As for Theophanes, the fact that the Kindites had remained an important tribe while the Ghassanids declined may explain why he chose only to mention the Kindite Arethas. His comment, however, that after the treaty "all Palestine, Arabia, and Phoenicia enjoyed much peace and calm", suggests that all the other Arab tribes, including the hostile Jabalah (AM 5990), had also been induced to peace and were therefore part of this treaty; cf. Kavar (1958a) 237ff.

²³ Cf. Fowden (1999) 178. For political leaders, the consolidation of Arab allegiance at shrines and monasteries was important for political and economic reasons and from permanent holy places they could try to exercise political control over both transhumant and settled tribes.

²⁴ On the Ghassanids, see Ya'qūbī, *Historiae*, I.205, cf. Shahid (1995) 694; and on the Kindites, Shahid (1995) 696–697 and Robin (1996) *passim*. For the spread of Christianity and the erection of Christian churches in Arabia, before and during the reign of Anastasius, see Aigrain (1924) *passim* and Capizzi (1969) 185–187, Letsios (1989) 527–529.

²⁵ On the different doctrinal positions concurrently held in the east during Anastasius'

changed affiliation later, as they came under the influence of the powerful and persuasive Severus and Philoxenus. The Ghassanid phylarch was invited to attend the consecration of the church of SS Sergius, Bacchus and Leontius in Bostra, the capital of the province of Arabia.²⁶ The significance of one of the patron saints of the cathedral should not be overlooked; Bacchus was also the patron saint of the Ghassanids.²⁷ The phylarch was also present at Severus' consecration as patriarch of Antioch, probably at the invitation of Philoxenus. Inviting attendance at such events was a diplomatic gesture by the Romans designed to impress the Arabs and increase cultural and ecclesiastical ties.²⁸

There is evidence, too, for the popularity of Bacchus' fellow martyred soldier, St. Sergius. Again, Anastasius, followed by Justinian, acted to exploit Arab enthusiasm for the cult and in doing so, to underscore the common ground between Arabs and Romans. Thus, on the feast of St. Sergius in 514, we find Severus delivering a sermon on the passion of SS Sergius and Bacchus in Chalcis; significantly, an important camp for the pastoral Arabs in this region, who would have gathered there for the festival.²⁹ Many churches built during this period were dedicated to SS Sergius and Bacchus. At the fort of Zabad, south-east of Beroea, a basilica to St. Sergius is dated by inscription to 24th September, 512. The inscription is trilingual, Greek, Syriac and Arabic, and is a further indication of the regard for St. Sergius felt by Arabic Christians.³⁰

Without doubt, the main focus of the cult rested at Resafa, also known as Sergiopolis, and briefly, after a period of restoration by the emperor, as Anastasiopolis.³¹ Resafa, a watering point and located on a crossroads, was a key position for the Romans: in military terms, for the monitoring of movement of hostile Persians and Arabs; and in economic terms, for observation of the caravan routes and trade. Increasingly throughout the fifth century, Resafa took on a new significance as the home of the cult of St Sergius and by the end of the fifth century had become a major pilgrimage shrine³². In the latter stages of

reign, see ch. 5, pp.138–139.

²⁶ Cf. Fowden (1999) 111ff on the appeal of St. Sergius to both Chalcedonians and monophysites.

²⁷ Cf. Shahid (1995) 699. On the popularity of the cult of St. Sergius among the Ghassanids, Vasiliev (1956) 314–315.

²⁸ Cf. Shahid (1995) 697–699.

²⁹ Sev. *Hom. Cath.* 57, PO 4.1.83–94; cf. Fowden (1999) 22–26.

³⁰ For further details and bibliography, Vasiliev (1956) 314–315, Trombley (1997) 187, Fowden (1999) 117–118.

³¹ On the location of Resafa, Fowden (1999) 1–6, 65ff, for a description of Resafa today, 77ff, and on the name, 92–93.

³² On the early history of the cult, Fowden (1999) 7–17; 26–29.

the fifth and during the sixth century, Resafa was developed to meet the demands of the pilgrims. The city walls were improved, cisterns and hostels were built and larger and more lavish churches were erected with shrines to house the relics, and to allow pilgrims to collect holy oil and water.

Unfortunately, as with much of the building activity at this time, it is difficult to date the various phases of construction, which consequently creates problems in trying to attribute work to one particular emperor. That there are two stages to the construction of the walls dating from this period would suggest that both Anastasius and Justinian had turned their attention to the security of the site.³³ As for the churches, there has been longstanding uncertainty as to their dating. There are three large churches under consideration: 'basilica A' in the south-east quarter of the city; 'basilica B' located south-east of the centre of the city; and a tetraconch church positioned on the north artery.

Basilica A is a monumental three-aisled structure, often thought to be the martyrion of St. Sergius, at the east end of which there was space for a shrine designed for the display of relics and affording easy access for pilgrims. Fragments of flasks and graffiti of the names of pilgrims and prayers to St. Sergius have been found at this site. To the north was a peristyle courtyard and to the south various annexes, most likely accommodation for the needs of the pilgrims. This basilica was previously dated by a reused inscription recording the dedication of a benefaction to the church by bishop Abraham in 559. However, it is now thought that the architecture of the church suggests a rather earlier date in the last quarter of the fifth century, and that the later benefaction was an addition to the existing structure.³⁴

Basilica B, on the other hand, is dated firmly by inscription to the spring of 518. The inscription mentions that the work was begun under the bishop Sergius and that "the other venerable shrine" (that is, basilica A) now held the relics of St. Sergius. To the north of the apse, there was the so-called 'trichoros', a triconch room, richly decorated with an elaborate opus sectile floor. A sarcophagus on a ledge on the eastern wall, and a table with channels for holy oil or water indicating the presence of another sarcophagus suggest that this room was also a shrine.

³³ There has been much debate about the dating of the walls. See, for example, Kamapp (1976), Harrison (1984), Gregory (1997) 174–180, and Brands (1998) esp. 72–74 and passim, who argues a date of the early sixth century for the walls, gate, tetraconch church and basilica B, though concedes that the walls may have been started by Anastasius and completed by Justinian; and Fowden (1999) 65 and 93ff for further bibliography. It is clear that Justinian was responsible for additional amenities for pilgrims.

³⁴ For further discussion and bibliography, Fowden (1999) 80ff.

While the name of Leontius, the soldier-martyr often associated with SS Sergius and Bacchus, is mentioned in graffiti, it has been suggested that one of the sarcophagi held the relics of Bacchus himself.³⁵ Finally, the tetraconch church has been dated by finds and by architectural style to the early sixth century. Its function is unclear, given the presence of the basilicas A and B, though it is possible that the three churches reflected different denominations, Chalcedonian or monophysite.³⁶

If the dating for these churches holds, it shows that there was a significant amount of building activity, especially in ecclesiastical building, during the reign of Anastasius, and it surely cannot be a coincidence that this period saw both the emergence of the site of Resafa as a major pilgrimage shrine and the increasing interest of the Ghassanids in the cult of SS Sergius and Bacchus. It is certainly true that in the 510s Anastasius elevated Resafa to the ecclesiastical rank of metropolitan status.³⁷ The continued loyalty of the Ghassanids showed that the emperor's efforts in forging ties by diplomacy and by ecclesiastical union had their rewards.

With rather less success, Anastasius tried to win the support of the Lakhmids of al-Hira by attempting to convert them to monophysite Christianity. There survives a letter from Philoxenus (himself a Persian) to Abū Ya'fur, the *stratelates* of the Lakhmids after al-Numan, in reply to a letter from Abū Ya'fur himself.³⁸ Abū Ya'fur was almost certainly Christian. If so, it is likely that he was outraged by the severe persecution of the monophysites in Persia by the Nestorians (whether or not he was himself Chalcedonian or monophysite) and wrote to Philoxenus for help.³⁹ The bishop did not delay in taking the opportunity to exhort Abū Ya'fur and the Lakhmids to monophysitism. Such a blatant attempt to win over Persian allies did not escape the notice of the Persian king, and the Lakhmid chief al-Mundhir III was hastily installed at Hira.⁴⁰ The monophysites were not to be so easily deflected from their purpose, however, and in 513 Severus sent two bishops in a

³⁵ For the inscription, see Gatier and Ulbert (1991) 169–182, also *SEG* XLI (1991) no. 1537; Fowden (1999) 87ff.

³⁶ Cf. Brands (1995) 590–597 and Fowden (1999) 91–92.

³⁷ It was also at this time that Anastasius brought Sergius' thumb to Constantinople, thus indicating the empire-wide interest in that cult. It has even been suggested that the Church of SS Sergius and Bacchus, built by Justinian in Constantinople, had originally been a project of Anastasius, planned to house the relic; cf. Fowden (1999) 132.

³⁸ For the text of the letter, Mingana (1925) 297–371. The letter dates from c. 500.

³⁹ On the terminology, see Brock (1996).

⁴⁰ Hira, although home to the Lakhmids, close allies of the Persians, was also home to many Christians; cf. Shahid (1989) especially 366. On Philoxenus and Abū Ya'fur, see Shahid (1995) 702–706.

bold attempt to convert al-Mundhir himself. It seems that the difficulty was not in conversion to Christianity for it is known that al-Mundhir had espoused Nestorianism at some point, and perhaps even Chalcedonianism, but monophysitism was associated specifically with the religion of the hostile Roman empire, and as a vassal of the Persian king, the Lakhmid chief was not to be persuaded.⁴¹

Efforts to consolidate alliances by religious affiliation also stretched further south to Southern Arabia, in particular to the Himyarites (in modern Yemen) and their Ethiopian neighbours across the Red Sea. These were key areas in terms of control of trade and both Persians and Romans were desperate to exert their influence there. The trade routes from the East, including the crucial silk route from China, entered the Roman Empire via two paths: by land over the Persian Empire, or by sea through the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea (for which good relations with the Himyarites and Ethiopians were essential) up to Clysma.⁴²

As a rule, pagans and Jews were more likely to be supportive of Persian interests and Christians of the Romans', with the result that the religious denominations of the tribes in these areas could become of increased significance, especially in times of hostility. There had been missionary activity as early as the fourth century when, during the reign of Constantius II, three churches were built in Himyar. However, in 380, we find that the Himyarite king and his family were Jews (converted by the rabbis of Yathrib [Medina]), both to help extend their own influence over neighbouring territories which were also Jewish, and to counteract the influence of the Romans who had recently Christianised Ethiopia.⁴³ In the fifth century, however, the pendulum swung again, as Christianity was popularised by a merchant named Hayyān, and gained ground over paganism and Judaism.⁴⁴ Najrān became the centre of Christianity and the Himyarites developed closer links with the Christian Ethiopians.⁴⁵

⁴¹ It is possible that he converted to Chalcedonianism for a short time under the influence of his orthodox wife, Hind, although the dating is not certain. It seems that Kavadh was able to turn him away from Christianity with the promise of rich booty from ecclesiastical foundations, and this is probably what prompted his attack on the Holy Land in 503. For more on al-Mundhir and his religious persuasion, see Aigrain (1924), cols.1225–1226; cf. Shahīd (1995) 706–709.

⁴² For a history of Clysma, Mayerson (1996) 119–126. It is clear that the Persians did maintain a near monopoly on maritime trade with the far east; see further Whitehouse and Williamson (1973) esp. 43–45.

⁴³ Cf. Robin (1996) 699.

⁴⁴ For the details, see Shahīd (1989) 361–370.

⁴⁵ Evidence for the presence of Ethiopian merchants in the Himyarite capital Zafār is attested in 504 by inscription; see Greatrex (1998) 226 with n.4 for bibliography.

In the lead-up to the Persian war and afterwards, Anastasius was keen to encourage the spread of Christianity since he needed the support of both Himyarites and Ethiopians to ensure the security of Roman trade passing through the Red Sea, as it was obviously impossible to use the land route across Persia. We know from the writing of John Diacrinomenus that his uncle, Silvanus, who was a monophysite bishop, was despatched to Himyar during Anastasius' reign and it is from this period that we have the first attestation of an organised ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁴⁶ Although the exact dating of the arrival of Silvanus in Himyar is unknown, it is clear that it would have taken place during the reign of the Christian king, Martad'īlān Yanūf, suggesting that his reign saw both political rapprochement with the Romans with the 502 *foedus*, and closer religious affiliation. His successor, M'adikarib Y'afur, was also a Christian and is recorded waging war against al-Mundhir in central Arabia in 516.⁴⁷ At Najrān, Christian activity increased, the ecclesiastical hierarchy became more elaborate and missionaries were sent out to other towns in Southern Arabia. Philoxenus consecrated two bishops, both named Paul; their dates are uncertain, but it is known that the second was installed sometime before 521 after the first was martyred in Zafār. It is likely that Paul I was consecrated circa 500 at a time when Anastasius was seeking to build support and foster closer ties.⁴⁸ The Arabs of Najrān were closely related to the Ghassanids and this may have contributed to their enthusiasm for the monophysite cause.⁴⁹

It is clear that the Romans benefited when Christianity was established as the religion of the ruling élite, and suffered during the periods when the Himyarite king was a non-Christian. Two particular incidents illustrate this point. The first concerns the reign of the king, Dimion or Dimnos, who, as a reaction against the increasing influence of Christianity and the Romans, executed Roman traders and confis-

⁴⁶ It is not known which was his see, though Mukhā, Najrān or the capital Zafār seem likely contenders. On the despatch of Silvanus, Smith (1954) 461, Harmatta (1974) 103, and Shahīd (1995) 709–710 and (1989) 376–381, 401–404 who suggests the possibility that a bishop was requested after an Ethiopian expedition which had strengthened Christianity in Himyar. See Robin (1996) 700f for bibliography and references.

⁴⁷ The dates for Martad'īlān Yanūf cannot be fixed with certainty; he is attested ruling in 504, and Robin (1996) 700–701 argues that his successor, M'adikarib Y'afur, was installed by an Abyssinian expedition, dated to 518/9. However, the inscription attesting to the activity of M'adikarib Y'afur in 516 appears to contradict this view; cf. Rubin (1989) 399–400, Greatrex (1998) 228 with n.8.

⁴⁸ Cf. Shahīd (1989) 376.

⁴⁹ Shahīd (1995) 711–712, Robin (1996) 700. For further discussion and on why Najrān became monophysite rather than Nestorian, Shahīd (1989) 373–374.

cated their merchandise.⁵⁰ The second concerns the more notorious Dhu Nuwas, the Jewish king who defeated the Ethiopians and was responsible for the massacre of the Christians at Najrān.⁵¹ The Ethiopian king, Ella Asheba, sought aid from Justin for an expedition against Dhu Nuwas; he was finally victorious in 525 and once again Christianity was established as the dominant faith.⁵² The significance of Anastasius' concern to promote Christianity in these regions should not be understated.

There is some indication that the raiding of the tribe of Blemmyes posed a further threat to the Red Sea trade route but was also dealt with during Anastasius' reign. Our evidence amounts to only fragments of what has been identified as a panegyric to Anastasius concerning a war against the Blemmyes and a passage of Joshua the Stylite: the emperor had refused Kavadh's demand for gold in 491, "For the wars I have with barbarians are not insubstantial: with those called Germans, those called Blemmyes, and many others."⁵³

It was not only in Yemen and Ethiopia that Anastasius concentrated his efforts on improving the economic fortunes of the empire and securing the trade route in the event of war with Persia. The chronicle of Theophanes offers ■ report on the operations of Romanus, the Roman officer who defeated the Arabs in 498, and the famous recapture of the island of Iotabe.⁵⁴ This island had been lost during the reign of Leo I. A certain Arab, Amorkesos (Imru' al-Qays), abandoning his Persian alliance, settled in the province of Arabia, from where he launched raids against his former patrons. It appears he was successful in seizing a large area of Palestine III, including a number of villages

and Iotabe, a small island in the Red Sea in the gulf of Aqaba, from which he expelled all the Roman tax collectors and gathered the custom dues himself.⁵⁵ Leo did not remonstrate, but in 474 transferred Iotabe to him along with the title of *phylarch*, giving him surveillance over both the land and sea trade routes, as outlined above. Leo was not entirely naïve, for by giving Amorkesos the phylarchate, he was also giving him the responsibility of policing and securing these trade routes. After all, Amorkesos himself had proved the weakness of the Roman defences in this area.⁵⁶

There had been no change in the situation since the reign of Leo. However, the year 498 which saw the death of Amorkesos also saw the ending of the Isaurian war, allowing Anastasius to turn his attention to other matters. It was thus a convenient time to break off the original treaty. The arrangement of Leo had been degrading to Rome and full of potential disaster. Amorkesos could easily block Rome's trading routes, and already the empire was deprived of an important source of income in the loss of custom dues. The account of Theophanes mentions the opportunity for the Roman merchants to import goods from India and to bring the assessed tax to the emperor. The retaking of the island therefore addressed two key aims of Anastasius, opening direct access to Indian trade and ensuring that the lucrative customs duties were now collected for the Roman empire rather than for the Arabs or Persians.

⁵⁵ For an account of Amorkesos' capture of Iotabe and his favourable reception by Leo, Malchus fr.1, with Vasiliev (1956) 313, Letsios (1989) 525ff, and Greatrex (1998) 227 n.5, n.6 on the wealth of the island and 228. Letsios (1989) 533-535 warns of the possible bias in Malchus' account; his criticism of Leo could result from the fact that he may have been writing during the reign of Anastasius. A great deal of work has been carried out by Mayerson to establish the identity and location of Iotabe. He argues that it cannot be modern Tiran, as identified by Abel (1938), and draws attention to the difficulties Amorkesos, as an Arab, would have experienced in mounting a naval attack, and to the fact that none of the Roman sources describe the counter-attack of Romanus as an assault from the sea. As Theophanes states that Iotabe should be "given back to the Roman traders to inhabit under its own laws", this indicates that the island fell outside Roman jurisdiction (beyond Palestine III), cf. Procopius *B.P.* 1.19.1-7 who states that the island was not less than one thousand stadia (one hundred and thirty miles) from Aila. Archaeologists have found no evidence of buildings, a harbour or water supply on Tiran, and noted that its position, surrounded by reefs, would have rendered navigation very difficult (Mayerson (1992) 1-3). In a later article, Mayerson (1995) discusses the possibility that Iotabe is a port linked to the land; this would remove the problem of explaining a naval attack, and incidentally make the site convenient for onward transport of the merchandise by either land or sea. He suggests that the site should be found south of the gulf of Aqaba in one of the many coves of the Red Sea where large merchant ships could unload their cargoes onto smaller vessels which could then navigate more easily up towards Clysmā, and where customs duties could be imposed as the goods were being transferred.

⁵⁶ Cf. Letsios (1989) 535.

⁵⁰ Greatrex (1998) 227, n.7 for the dating of this episode to the late fifth century contra Shahīd who identifies Dimion as Dhu Nuwas. For the retaliatory expedition of the Ethiopians, Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 846, Mal. 433-434, Theoph. AM 6035, with Mango and Scott (1997) 324, n.1. On the punitive expeditions of the Ethiopians against the Himyarites, Rubin (1989) 389ff and Blockley (1992) 88.

⁵¹ It has been argued that Dhu Nuwas, given his links with al-Mundhir and the Jews of Medina, was acting for the Persians in his attempt to liberate Himyar from Ethiopian control; cf. Harmatta (1974) 103-105.

⁵² Möberg (1924) xxiv-lxxii, Shahīd (1971), Brock and Harvey (1987) 100-121, Greatrex (1998) 229-231, and Evans (1996) 112-114 for further details.

⁵³ For the fragments of the panegyric, see Vasiliev (1950) 285-286; Josh. 20 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 18-19, n.88, and Greatrex (1998) 61.

⁵⁴ Theoph. AM 5990; *PLRE* II.948, Romanus 7. Theophanes noted his role in the successful campaign against Ogaros, son of the Kindite Arethas, and Jabalah, son of the Ghassanid Tha'laba. The Kindites went to the aid of the Ghassanids, but were themselves defeated, and Ogaros was captured. See further on Romanus, Aigrain (1924), col.1197; he also defeated Ogaros' brother, Badicharimos who, in 501, invaded Palestine, Phoenicia and Syria. On Romanus' operations, Theoph. AM 5990, Rubin (1989) 388ff and Shahīd (1989) 125-127.

Related to the re-establishment of Roman control of Iotabe and the securing of the last part of the trade route from the East up the Red Sea to Clysma, is the promulgation of an imperial edict.⁵⁷ Fragments of this edict have been found in several places in Arabia, all important army posts: five fragments at Imtān, two at Umm al-Jimāl, one at Salkhad, sixty-eight at Qasr al-Hallābāt and six at Bostra. The latter were found, re-used in the wall of the mosque al-'Umarī,⁵⁸ and cover four articles:

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Κ]αῖσαρ
[Φλαοὺς Ἀνα]στάσιος
[Εὐσεβῆ]ς Νικητῆς
[Τροπαιοῦχος Μέγιστος]
[ἀεὶ Σεβαστὸς Αὐγουστος]
[δεδωκεν τοὺς ὑπογεγραμ-]
[μένους θεῖους τύπους]
[ὥστε τὸν δοῦκα]
μόνα λαμβά -
νειν τὰ ἀφορι[σ] -
μ[έ]να αὐτῷ κα -
5 τὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον
ἔθος ὑπὲρ ἄνω -
νῶν καὶ κατίτ[ων]
ἐκ τοῦ δημο -
σίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ[ν]
10 [μέρους] τῆς δω -
[δεκάτης] καὶ ἀπὸ
[τοῦ κο]μμερκια -
[ρίου γ]ε τὸν ἐν
[Μεσοπ]οταμίᾳ
15 [καὶ ἀπ]ὸ τοῦ Κλύσ -
[ματος τὸ]ν ἐν
[Παλαιστίνῃ]
[καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο]
ἐξ οἷας δῆπο -
20 τε αἰτίας λάμ -
βάνειν.
ὥστε ἕκαστον
τῶν δουκικῶν
καὶ σκρινιariών
25 [κα]ὶ ὀφει[κ]ιαλί -
ων τὴν ἐν ταῖς
μάτρινιν ὀρδι -
νατίονα φυλάτ -
τειν καὶ μηδένα

30 βαθμὸν ἢ νῦν
ἢ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν
[αλ]λάττειν πα -
[ρ]ὰ τὴν τάξιν
τῆς μάτρινος.
35 ὥστε τὰ πρακ -
τῖα τῶν δουκι -
κῶν μηκέτι πι -
πράσκεισθαι ἄλ -
λά κατὰ βαθμὸν
40 ἀνύεσθαι οὐτ[ως].

The Emperor Caesar Anastasius, Pius, Victor, Triumphator Maximus, semper Augustus, Augustus has issued the sacred orders appended below:

That the *dux* receive only what according to old custom has been assigned to him for rations and fodder from the public treasury and from the assessment of the twelfth, and furthermore that from the collector of customs indeed (in Mesopotamia) the *dux* of Mesopotamia, and from the (port of) Clysma, the (*dux*) of Palestina (receive appropriations), and that (the *dux*) receive nothing else for any reason whatsoever.

That each of the *duciani* and *scriniarii* and *officiales* preserve the order of rank (provided for) in the official registers, and that no one either now or hereafter change (his) grade contrary to the order of the register.

That the posts of the *duciani* be no longer sold, but be held according to grade as follows ...⁵⁹

The first article is ■ re-enactment of previous legislation which had fixed the resources (a percentage of the *annona* and *capitus* from the treasury) allowed to the *duces* of the provinces of Palestine and Mesopotamia. It was decreed that the *commercarius* of the province should give the *dux* of Mesopotamia a part of his resources, and that the *commercarius* of Clysma was responsible for making a payment to the *dux* of Palestine.⁶⁰ The title *commercarius* appears for the first time in

⁵⁹ Translation based on that by Littmann, Magie, Stuart (1921) 251.

⁶⁰ Sartre (1982a) 115–116 notes that the *dux* of Palestine did not have authority over Clysma which belonged to Egypt. He argues, however, (contra Mayerson, n.54) that Aqaba and Iotabe (depending on its exact location) were located within Palestine III. As Iotabe was the place where the customs were paid, and the *commercarius* of Clysma was ultimately responsible for their collection, then these revenues should be returned in part to the *dux* of Palestine; cf. Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 158–160, Mayerson (1996) 123. As to the amount of revenue to be set aside for the *duces*, the reconstruction of δω-[δεκάτης] (lines 10–11) has been taken as a reference to the usual customs tax of one-twelfth levied on imports and exports (that is, an eighth (*octava*) of the value of the merchandise; cf. Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 86 for links with the customs tax of one-twelfth levied on Cilician sailors at Abydos). Mayerson (1992) argues against the suggestion that the presence of tax collectors (δεκατηλόγοι) on the island indicates

⁵⁷ Cf. Parker (1986b) 30ff and Shahid (1989) 131–133, with notes 1–8 for relevant bibliography, Letsios (1989) 350. This edict is similar to that found at Ptolemais in Cyrenaica which regulates the details of military service in the Pentapolis.

⁵⁸ Sartre (1982a) nos. 9045 and 9046.

this period and seemingly evolved from ■ bureaucratic change whereby the administration of customs passed from the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* to the office of the praetorian prefect under whose aegis high-ranking *scriniarii*, with the name *commerciarii*, were appointed to be responsible for the collection of customs tax.⁶¹ The reissuing of previous legislation and the introduction of a new official point to the added importance Anastasius placed on the collection of custom revenues from Mesopotamia and Clysma. These initiatives were linked with the various measures to increase security of trade and customs for the Romans investigated so far, and the heightened concern to provide the *duces* of Mesopotamia and Palestine with increased resources, particularly for the former which would bear the forefront of any Persian aggression. The edict is not dated, but it seems likely that it was promulgated shortly after 498 to clarify the old law now that Iotabe was again in the hands of the Romans.

The other articles relate to regulation of the ranks of all officials, especially concerning recruitment and promotion. These measures were a reflection of the emperor's care for efficient administration at a time when good order in the army was a priority, as was his meticulousness in preserving precious revenues from inefficient or corrupt practices. Spurious promotions were damaging to the imperial treasury. More information can be construed from the fragments at Qasr al-Hallābāt, though none of the fragments were found in situ and many blocks had been trimmed so many of the lines are now incomplete. As well as the above rescripts there are fragments concerning the distribution of supplies and improvement of justice for soldiers.⁶²

In conclusion, Anastasius had a far reaching eastern foreign policy

that a tax of 10% (the δέκατη) was imposed on ships. He suggests that the word was merely borrowed from Demosthenes (subsequently used only by Harpocration and Basil of Caesarea) and has no connection with the specific amount levied on cargoes passing through the port. Littmann, Magie and Stuart (1921) 30 relate the δω-[δέκατ]ης to the assessment of the twelfth of the supplies furnished to the troops, as mentioned by the Ptolemais edict, or to the *duodecima annonarum pars* referred to in *CJ* I.46.4,2.

⁶¹ Mal. 396 mentions Procopius of Antioch who was an ex-*commerciarius* in 507; Danstrup (1946) 164, Stein (1949) II.213–215, Karayannopoulos (1958) 164–165, Oikonomides (1986), Delmaire (1989) 293. It has been suggested that it was about this time that the *agens in rebus* at Clysma was also replaced by a *commerciarius* (Stein (1949) II 215, n.1) but this idea has been opposed by Delamire (1989) 293 who argued that while the *commerciarius* was responsible to the praetorian prefect, the *agens in rebus* reported to the *magister officiorum*. However, in Egypt, administration of customs was the task of either the *vindices* (under the praetorian prefect) or the 'alabarques' (subordinate to the *comes sacrarum largitionum*); cf. Rouillard (1928) 100, Stein (1949) II.214, n.1, Delmaire (1989) 286.

⁶² See further, ch. 6, pp.214–215; cf. Sartre (1982a) 118ff and Littmann, Magie, Stuart (1921) 31ff.

by which, on the eve of war with Persia, he sought to capitalise on the resources of the empire and to promote ties with Arab tribes by means of diplomacy and careful cultural and religious affiliation. These tribes, close to the poorly defended Roman frontier, would be useful, not only directly in providing military aid, but also in safeguarding trade routes and thus ensuring the continuation of revenue to the imperial treasury. In conjunction with the latter economic concern came the recapture of Iotabe and the appointment of a new official at the terminus of the sea trade route, Clysma, to ensure an efficient hand-over of revenue to those provinces which would need funding most in the event of war. This was a broad and complex interlocking foreign and economic policy and highlights the particular concerns of the Anastasian government: safeguarding the economy, accumulating resources, securing borders and building alliances. These are the concerns we see at the heart of imperial policy in other spheres, including relations with the west and the domestic administration of the empire.

The Persian War 502–506

Anastasius had not sought war with Persia in 502 and, judging by the initial faltering response of the Roman army, was not prepared to conduct a defence of the eastern provinces at that moment. A narrative of the war will reveal, not only the principal ambitions pursued by the Persian ruler Kavadh throughout the conflict, but also the response of the Roman military when set against the context of what Anastasius was trying to do for the empire; especially in his economic policies. Such a narrative will also highlight the main phases of the war: namely, the initial easy victories of Kavadh characterised, as they were, by the desire to gain booty and, consequently, esteem and honour from his own people; and the successes of the Romans later in the war. Anastasius, a civil servant by training, can have had little practical advice to offer to his generals, but he nevertheless would be responsible for the outcome of the war in terms of overall direction of the war effort: the appointment of the generals, securing the loyalty of the frontier population and diplomatic overtures towards the Persians. Above all, Anastasius was determined not to accede to Persian demands for funds since this would be both to the detriment of the Roman treasury he had been building up during the first ten years of his reign, and to the advantage of Kavadh who, as we shall see, required funds to safeguard the position of Persia and also to boost his own position.

It was, therefore, financial concerns and internal problems in Persia which triggered the outbreak of the war in 502 after over a century of

relatively peaceful relations. These events have been well documented and require only a brief outline here.⁶³ The fifth century had begun with conciliatory overtures. In the year 408, just before the death of Arcadius, negotiations were held and arrangements were made concerning the protection of Christian subjects in Persia and the restriction of trade to selected towns close to the frontier. It was also at this time that the dying king recommended that his young son, Theodosius II, come under the protection of Yezdegerd I.⁶⁴ The following reign of Theodosius witnessed only two rather minor disturbances of this peace. The first invasion (421/422) was led by Bahram V (420–438) who needed a foreign victory to secure his precarious hold on the Persian throne. The increasing intolerance of the Persians towards the Romans' Christian proselytising, especially among the Arabs, provided ■ convenient pretext for the war, but the two sides proved to be evenly matched, and in 422 a treaty was negotiated. Its terms forbade the persecution of Christians and stated that neither side should receive each other's Saracen subjects. This treaty established peace for one hundred years.⁶⁵ The second more minor disturbance occurred in 440 when Yezdegerd II, probably in search of easy plunder, raided Roman Armenia, but was quickly induced to peace.⁶⁶

For the remainder of the fifth century, Rome and Persia were preoccupied with hostilities elsewhere. The Romans were menaced in turn by Huns, Goths, internal problems, and conflicts with the Vandals and Isaurians, while the Persians were overcome by the Hephthalite Huns to such an extent that the Romans stepped in to ransom the Persian king, Peroz.⁶⁷ On the other hand, the Romans did not accede to all

Persian requests for financial assistance, and this has led to the continuing debate on the justification of their refusal which rests on the question of whether the Romans had ever agreed to contribute to the defence of the Caspian Gates. Although the arguments have been rehearsed many times, it is worth outlining the problem here, for Anastasius' refusal to give monetary aid ostensibly provoked Kavadh's invasion in 502.⁶⁸

The 'Caspian Gates' or the Dariel Pass in the Caucasus Mountains, if left undefended, allowed the Sabir Huns to come south and threaten both Persian and Roman territory. The view that there was a treaty stems from an oft-quoted passage of John the Lydian:

Naturally, then, after the ill-success of the Romans during Julian's reign, discussions were held ... to the effect that both governments with mutually shared expenses build a fort at the aforementioned entrance [of the Caucasus] and set up ■ garrison in the area for curbing the barbarians who were pouring down through it.⁶⁹

However, at this time, the Romans were occupied to the west and the north, and the Persians, who were more exposed to the threat from the undefended Caspian Gates, built a fortress there and installed a garrison.

From this pretext the Persians, streaming forth little by little into the Syrias and Cappadocias, attacked the Romans for allegedly being wronged in consequence of being deprived of the Romans' share in the expense incurred for their common interests ...

Sporacius, sent by Theodosius I to negotiate, was unable to reach an agreement,

And this state of affairs dragged on down to the time of our Anastasius with both conferences and pacts, and, in a word, with suspensions.⁷⁰

threat. On the other hand, if cultivated properly, the Hephthalites would fight for Persia against Rome. See Greatrex (1994), chapter 3, section a), for a detailed discussion of the Hephthalites and Procopius.

⁶³ On this question, see e.g. Bury (1923) II.6, Blockley (1985) 63ff; Rubin (1986a) 40ff and (1986b) 677ff believes that an agreement about shared defence of the Caspian Gates was made in 363 and represents Rome's actions throughout the fifth century as trying to extricate herself from the unwelcome position of owing money to Persia, contra Braund (1994) 269–270 and Greatrex (1998) 14ff.

⁶⁴ γίνονται δὲ οὖν λόγοι μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἀστοχίαν ... ὥστε κοιναῖς δαπάναις ἀμφὲς τὰ πολιτεύματα φρουρίον ἐπὶ τῆς εἰρημένης εἰσόδου κατασκευάσαι, ἐπιστήσαι τε βοήθειαν τοῖς τόποις πρὸς ἀναχαίτισμόν τῶν κατατρεχόντων δι' αὐτῆς βαρβάρων. John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.52 (tr. Carney).

⁶⁵ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἀφορμῆς οἱ Πέρσαι Ῥωμαίοις ἐπετέθησαν, κατὰ σμικρὸν ἐπὶ τὰς Συρίας καὶ Καππαδοκίας ἐκχεόμενοι, ὥς δὲθεν ἀδικοῦμενοι καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν γενομένην δαπάνην κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον Ῥωμαίοις ἀποστερούμενοι ... καὶ

⁶³ For relations between Rome and Persia from 363 to 502, see Whitby (1988) 202ff, Blockley (1992) passim, Howard-Johnston (1995), Greatrex (1998) chapters 2 and 3.

⁶⁴ Proc. B.P. I.2.1–10, Theoph. AM 5900; Bardill and Greatrex (1996), part I.

⁶⁵ Cf. Bury (1923) II.5. See also Holum (1977), esp. 170–171 on the terms of the treaty, and van Rompay (1995) on the Persian Christians, and discussion by Greatrex (1993). Theological differences remained ■ constant problem. The later condemnation of Nestorianism made relations increasingly awkward. At the synod of Sidon in 486, the bishop Barsauma, with the approval of the Persian king, made Nestorianism the official doctrine of the Persian Christian Church. Meanwhile, Zeno closed the theological school of Edessa which advocated Nestorianism, and banished Nestorians from the empire; cf. Labourt (1904) 156ff and Capizzi (1969) 175.

⁶⁶ Cf. Greatrex (1998) 13–14 with n.34.

⁶⁷ On this episode, Greatrex (1998) 17, n.50. The Hephthalite Huns were a significant factor in the Anastasian war. During the fifth century, these so-called 'White Huns', having crossed from beyond the Oxus, drove away the Kushans/Kidarites, and eventually became overlords of Sogdia, Khoten and over thirty other regions; their empire, it is said, stretched from the Caspian Sea to the Indus. Little is known about their origins, name, or location, yet they proved to be an important factor in Romano-Persian relations, for Persia could not afford a war on two fronts and on occasion was forced to hastily conclude peace with Rome, in order to concentrate on the barbarian

However, Joshua refers to the existence of a much simpler treaty based on mutual assistance in times of war:

Furthermore, Romans and Persians had entered into an agreement that if they had need of each other while at war with another nation, they would assist by giving either three hundred fighting men along with their weapons and horses, or three hundred staters for each man, with the choice being made by the partner in need.⁷¹

It is unlikely that the Romans would have agreed to provide specific aid for the defence of the Caspian Gates in 363. Indeed, shortly afterwards, in 369/370, the Persians complained of Roman interference in this area, which hardly suggests that they had previously sought co-operation. There are no clear references in the sources to a regular payment and the frequent requests by the Persians for financial assistance are made on an *ad hoc* basis and do not refer to the expectation of a regular subsidy.⁷² This conclusion suggests that Anastasius should not be blamed for the outbreak of war on the grounds of unfairly ignoring the terms of a treaty.⁷³ The dispute over the border garrison town of Nisibis may explain why the Romans were increasingly less inclined to lend monetary aid, at least after 483. Ceded to the Persians in the 363 treaty, Nisibis was due to return to Roman control after one hundred and twenty years, and when the Persian king, Balash, applied to Zeno for help, the latter replied, "the taxes of Nisibis which you are getting are enough for you".⁷⁴ It is certain that the Roman claim was not valid, but Nisibis remained a sticking point and Anastasius too used it as an

ταῦτα ἕως τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἀναστασίου διεσῶρη λαλούμενά τε καὶ τυπούμενα καὶ ἀπλῶς ἠρτημένα. John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.53 (tr. Carney).

⁷¹ Josh. 8 (tr. Trombley and Watt); Mal. 449–450 includes a letter from Kavadh referring to the promise of mutual assistance. Greatrex (1998) 15–16 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 9, n.35 date this agreement to the mid-fifth century.

⁷² Greatrex (1998) 16–17, nn.47 and 48 suggests that far from refusing to make agreed payments to the Persians which led to the cooling of relations, the Romans did offer help on several occasions; cf. Josh. 9–10.

⁷³ Another area of confusion surrounds the supposed offer of the defence of the Caspian Gates. Procopius (*B.P.* I.16.4) records that Kavadh later claimed that he had offered to sell the fort at the pass to Anastasius who had refused, but at another point states that the fort was offered to Anastasius by the Hun Ambazouces (*B.P.* I.10.9–11). However, we know that Kavadh regained control of the fort after the Hun's offer, so either his own offer was made at a later date or he offered something clearly not in his possession.

As for Anastasius' policy here, while it could be argued that he had let slip the opportunity to control the strategically placed fort, there were sound reasons for refusing the offer. On one hand, the location made it very difficult to support a garrison of soldiers there, while on the other, it was sound policy to encourage (rather than impede) the Hunnic raids into Persian territory (e.g. the Hunnic attack on Persia just before the outbreak of war; Zach. of Myt. VII.3); cf. Isaac (1992) 230–231, Greatrex (1998) 126, n.17 and 129.

⁷⁴ Josh. 18 (tr. Trombley and Watt).

argument for refusing to give financial help.⁷⁵

After the death of King Peroz in battle against the Hephthalite Huns, the throne passed to his brother, Blases, but after four years of financial hardship in the Persian empire, he was deposed and replaced by his nephew, Kavadh. In recent times, Persia had increasingly faced internal turmoil exacerbated by economic failure which was triggered by years of warring against the Hephthalites and followed by hefty tribute payments to secure peace. At the same time, the power of the Great King was gradually being eroded by the powerful nobility and Zoroastrian priests. However, although Kavadh was able to manipulate the ideas propagated by the growing Mazdakite movement to counter-balance the influence of these opponents,⁷⁶ he could not escape the plotting of the aristocracy and was detained in the so-called 'prison of oblivion' in 496 or 497.⁷⁷ With the help of his wife or sister or a friend by the name of Siyāvash, he managed to escape and sought protection from the Hephthalite king. According to one source, he married his own niece (Peroz's daughter) at the Hephthalite court, and he was certainly given troops and resources to recover his throne.⁷⁸ If these events seem astonishing given the unsettled nature of Persian-Hephthalite relations, it should be remembered that Kavadh had spent much of his early life at the Hunnic court as a hostage for his father's maintenance of peace. Zamasp, now the ruling king in Persia and known for his clemency and justice, had no desire to stand in the way of his brother and abdicated voluntarily. His fate and that of the other nobles is uncertain: doubtless, a certain Gushnaspadh was killed as he had suggested this fate for Kavadh after his dethronement.⁷⁹

Kavadh's humiliation and subsequent restoration to his throne had a

⁷⁵ That the Roman claim that Nisibis should be returned after one hundred and twenty years was a fabrication, see Greatrex (2002) 248, n.22, with bibliography, and Trombley and Watt (2000) 8, n.34 and 19, n.90.

⁷⁶ Mazdak preached to the lower classes that all men are equal, and he advocated community of property and women. It is unclear whether the king was a sincere partisan of this early form of communism or merely supported the rise of the Mazdakite movement against the interests of the aristocracy. This question is debated by Christensen (1925) 90ff and (1944), chapter 7. See also Labourt (1904) 154ff *CHir.* III.1.150ff, Crone (1991) 21–22, 30 and Greatrex (1998) 50ff.

⁷⁷ Joshua's account (chapter 23), that Kavadh knew of the conspiracy in advance and fled to the territory of the Huns, is contradicted by all other sources which claim he was deposed and imprisoned.

⁷⁸ Josh. 24; Trombley and Watt (2000) 21, n.104.

⁷⁹ See the different traditions concerning the dethronement of Kavadh from the *Royal Sassanid Chronicle* in Christensen (1925) 25ff. For a detailed discussion of the life of Kavadh generally, see Merten (1906) 159ff, Christensen (1925) 90ff and Greatrex (1998) 49ff. Note the error of Procopius *B.P.* I.5.2, who confuses Kavadh's brother Zamasp with Blases, the successor of Peroz.

clear effect on his relations with Rome and without doubt contributed to his decision to initiate hostilities. In addition to the internal problems outlined above, the country was now in the grip of famine, the tribes of the Tamuraye and Kadishaye were in revolt, the latter even threatening Nisibis,⁸⁰ and there had been some recent trouble with the Armenians.⁸¹ Back in 491, he had applied to Zeno for financial assistance. Before the embassy could reach Constantinople, however, Zeno died and Kavadh ordered his ambassadors to return immediately to Anastasius, not with the usual diplomatic acknowledgements of congratulations to the new ruler and assurances of continued peace, but with a renewed demand for money under the threat of war.⁸² The sequence of correspondence between Anastasius and Kavadh in the 490s reveals Anastasius' strategy before the outbreak of war: not to yield to the financial demands of the Persians, nor to provoke war needlessly. In 491, he refused Kavadh's request, indicating that he had better uses for the money and, following Zeno's precedent, cited the refusal of the Persians to return Nisibis.⁸³ A year or two later, taking advantage of Anastasius' involvement in the Isaurian war, Kavadh tried again. This time, Anastasius unbent so far as to offer a loan on receipt of a written acknowledgement. At this point, Kavadh had no opportunity to go to war, as he was preoccupied with unrest among the Persarmenians and the internal problems within Persia. The Greek sources record that another demand for money was made in 498 after the restoration of Kavadh, but Anastasius again refused, no doubt applying the maxim, 'divide and rule'. It was sound policy to foster bad relations between the Persians and Huns.⁸⁴

A last request for monetary aid in 502 was met by another offer of a loan and Kavadh, desperate to improve the fortunes of his treasury and to put an end to the uprisings of the Tamuraye and Kadishaye, announced his decision to march on Roman territory.⁸⁵ The intelligence

⁸⁰ Josh. 24, Trombley and Watt (2000), 19–20, n.96. On Kavadh's insecurity, Greatrex (1998) 49–50.

⁸¹ After his restoration to the throne, Kavadh offered freedom of worship to the Armenians provided that they supported him against the Romans, which they reluctantly agreed to; Merten (1906) 160, Grousset (1947) 231, Greatrex (1998) 48 and 50, Trombley and Watt (2000) 18, n.86.

⁸² Trombley and Watt (2000) 17, n.82.

⁸³ Josh. 20.

⁸⁴ Proc. B.P. I.7.1–2, Theod. Lect. 552, Theoph. AM 5996. Joshua mentions no such request, but it is likely that Kavadh, on regaining his throne, was desperate for help to repay the Hephthalites; cf. Greatrex (1998) 52, n.40.

⁸⁵ The exact chronology of Kavadh's demands and the nature of Anastasius' responses is hard to determine. However, for views on the offer of a loan, see Bury (1923) II.10, with n.5 and Stein (1949) II.93 who see the offer of this loan as offensive, cf. Blockley

gathered from his Arab allies during their incursions in the 490s would have reassured him of the depleted state of Roman forces and garrisons and the dilapidated condition of Roman fortifications. However, while it is certain that he would have been aware of Anastasius' efforts to make an alliance with the Ghassanids and Kindites and of Roman diplomatic activity in the Red Sea area, he may not have known that Anastasius, during the first decade of his reign, had taken extensive measures to restore the diminishing treasury, and was in a position, at least financially, not to be bullied by aggressive Persian threats. Again, it is clear that Anastasius did not irresponsibly seek war with Persia; only a few years earlier he had denied help to the Armenians in a situation which would have led to direct conflict with Persia, but he would not agree to help out with Kavadh's tribute payments to the Hephthalites.⁸⁶ There is a clear consensus in the sources that Anastasius was legally justified in refusing to make the payments.⁸⁷

At the announcement of war, the Tamuraye and Kadishaye gave up their revolt and joined the Persian forces. The Armenians who were initially rather less enthusiastic were quickly persuaded after suffering a defeat and agreed to send a contingent in return for remaining Christian. Although relations had been tense between the two empires, the Romans may have been deceived into thinking that Persarmenia was the sole target of the Persian military preparations, which cannot have escaped their notice, and this may account for why they were still unprepared when Kavadh suddenly entered Roman Armenia on 22nd August, 502.⁸⁸ It is difficult to estimate when Anastasius would have heard intelligence of the invasion. His envoy, Rufinus, was to offer money only if Kavadh had not already crossed into Roman territory; that Kavadh had already made substantial progress across the border implies there was little leeway.⁸⁹ The invasion route is well known, as are the accounts of the overthrow of the three Roman cities which were unable to defend themselves. Kavadh, leading a force of Persians, Hephthalites and Armenians, headed straight for Theodosiopolis, an

(1992) 89, who believes it was a means by which Anastasius could extricate himself from any treaty obligation. Rubin (1986a) 40ff and (1986b) 677ff sees Anastasius' offer of a loan as an advance payment for the Caspian Gates subsidy. He depicts the Roman government in a dilemma; with defences dilapidated they could not afford to risk war by not paying, yet it was demeaning to be seen as a tribute-paying state. See also Greatrex (1998), esp. 77 with n.16.

⁸⁶ On the Armenians, Stein (1949) II.93, Greatrex (1998) 77.

⁸⁷ Proc. B.P. I.7.3, Eustath. fr.6, Theoph. AM 5996, Mich. Syr. IX.7.

⁸⁸ Claims, especially those of Procopius, that the Romans were taken by surprise by later assaults against cities should be treated with some scepticism; cf. Trombley and Watt (2000) 53, n.255.

⁸⁹ Cf. Merten (1906) 164, Stein (1949) II.194 and Lee (1993) 115.

important border fortress and the main city of Armenia Interior. Its defences were inadequate and run down and there were few Roman troops, but it seems that the city changed hands through the alleged treachery of its governor, Constantine, who defected to the Persian cause, taking up a military command.⁹⁰ There is some dispute in the sources as to the fate of the city. Joshua reports that "[Kavadh] therefore plundered the city, and destroyed and burnt it", while Zachariah of Mytilene said that he treated the inhabitants kindly. Complete destruction of the first city in the campaign might encourage the obedience of other cities in the path of the invading army, but since the city had been surrendered, destruction seems an inappropriate response and might encourage other cities to hold out. Enough remained of the city for Kavadh to leave behind a garrison force and for Anastasius to deem it worth rebuilding the walls.⁹¹ The main purpose of the campaign was to gather resources in the form of plunder, so looting rather than destruction would be more in line with Kavadh's aims.

The Persian army moved next to Martyropolis, the main city of Sophanene, which surrendered shortly after being attacked. The satrap, Theodorus, offered him the public taxes of the previous two years and, according to an oriental source, a gold cup. Kavadh was pleased to accept this offer of money and was magnanimous enough to spare the city and its environs, particularly as he considered that Sophanene was now in Persian possession.⁹²

By October, Kavadh was at the gates of Amida which, as the prosperous capital city of Roman Mesopotamia, was another obvious target; and it is a reflection on the continuing need for plunder that he

prepared to besiege the city in unfavourable climatic conditions.⁹³ Although the Amidenes were forewarned of the imminent assault,⁹⁴ they hardly had time to repair their defences, nor summon any Roman troops; any defence would have to come from the civilian inhabitants themselves, and the Persians reasonably assumed that the city would soon be theirs. However, the fortitude of the inhabitants forced a three-month delay on Kavadh, not to mention significant losses and damage to Persian morale. The sources are full of the ingenious devices of the defenders against the battering rams and offensive mounds of the Persians. They undermined and set fire to the first mound, and destroyed the second with a 'scorpion', a machine designed to hurl huge rocks.⁹⁵ After this last setback, Kavadh prepared to depart although, hoping not to leave empty handed after three months, he asked the governor of Mesopotamia for a payment. In response, the Amidenes demanded that he should recompense them for the damage caused to their territory.

Some sources attribute the fall of Amida to the hubris of the Amidenes in demanding money from Kavadh, and to the indecent actions of female prostitutes on the walls towards the Persian king, particularly as Kavadh himself claimed to have seen a vision of Christ promising the fall of the city. However, it is more likely that the city fell for more mundane and practical reasons. One of the Persian commanders tracing an Amidene entering and leaving the city discovered a passage into Amida. It was unfortunate for the Amidenes that the monks of the monastery of Mar John Urtaye guarding the tower at the end of the passage were asleep after a religious feast, and were easily overpowered.⁹⁶ Again there were allegations of treachery, especially as the archimandrite of the monastery was Persian.⁹⁷ The complete capture of the city the next morning was no easy task for the Persians, even with a foothold in the city already, and there was fierce fighting before the city finally fell. Kavadh stood below the city walls and

⁹⁰ See Greatrex (1998) 79 with n.25 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 50, n.244 on Constantine and his position as *comes Armeniae*, and on the state of the defences in 502, Croke and Crow (1983) 159, Whitby (1986a) 726 and Whitby (1987) 106–107. There is some dispute in the sources as to whether Constantine betrayed the city and fought for the Persians, before returning to the Romans in 504 (Josh. 48, Theoph. AM 5996), or whether he was taken prisoner and died in Persia (Mal. 398). It is possible that Malalas did not wish to record the treachery of a Roman officer, or confused him with Olympius, *dux* of Constantia, who was detained as a prisoner and died on Persian territory; cf. *PLRE* II.313–314, Constantinus 14, and II.804, Olympius 14, Trombley and Watt (2000) 51, n.245.

⁹¹ Josh. 48 (tr. Trombley and Watt), contra Zach. of Myt. VII.3; Proc. *de Aed.* III.3–4, B.P. I.10.18–19.

⁹² For the benefits of the route between the two cities for plunder, see Greatrex (1998) 80–81 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 53, n.257. On the poor state of defences at Martyropolis, see Adontz (1970) 113–114. On Martyropolis generally, see Merten (1906) 163 and Greatrex (1998) 81 with n.31 for the relevant sources. For the version including the golden cup, see the Armenian "Life of the bishop Marutha of Maipherkat" with Fowden (1999) 50–58.

⁹³ Proc. B.P. I.7.3. on the harsh winter conditions. The dramatic siege and brutal massacre of the citizens form the focal point of many historians' accounts of the 502–506 war; cf. Josh. 53ff, Zach. of Myt. VII.3, Proc. B.P. I.7, Evag. III.37, *Chronicon ad 1234* L–LI. Merten (1906) 141ff has a detailed discussion on the various versions. For the most detailed recent account, Greatrex (1998) 83–94, and on the sources, Greatrex (2002) 63–67.

⁹⁴ There was sufficient warning to allow inhabitants of the surrounding territory to seek refuge within the walls: for example, the monks of the monastery of John Urtaye.

⁹⁵ Cf. Greatrex (1998) 89, n.48.

⁹⁶ Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 814. See Dilleman (1962) 313–314 for the identity of the monks.

⁹⁷ Josh. 53, Marc. C. 502, Theoph. AM 5996. The *Narrationes Variae* (xvii–xviii) has a long passage concerning the sins of the inhabitants and the fall of Amida.

ordered all Persian deserters to be cut down. The fate of Amida, suitably harsh after such prolonged resistance, is again indicative of Kavadh's need for funds.⁹⁸ He thoroughly looted the town, particularly ecclesiastical foundations, and the leaders who had rejected his demand for payment were punished. Kavadh finally departed, giving orders for most of the remaining population to be taken to Persia and installing a garrison of three thousand under the command of Glon.

The successful outcome of the siege of Amida justified the three month delay and the suffering inflicted on the Persian army. Moreover, this was not the only military operation of the winter months.⁹⁹ The Persian king sent out various contingents on plundering expeditions. Among these units were the Hephthalites, the Lakhmids who successfully ravaged the regions around Carrhae and Edessa where walls were hastily repaired against them,¹⁰⁰ and a mixed group of Persians, Huns and Arabs who headed for Constantia. The Persians of this latter group were attacked by Eugenius, *dux* of Armenia, and Olympius, *dux* of Mesopotamia, but the Romans, despoiling the Persian dead, delayed in mobilizing a second time and were defeated.¹⁰¹ However, Eugenius, marching back to Theodosiopolis, was easily able to overcome the garrison left by Kavadh and retake the city for the Romans.¹⁰² Immediately, a single curtain wall, thirty feet high, was erected to improve the defences.¹⁰³

This rapid and victorious advance of the Persians, including the fall

⁹⁸ On the numbers killed, see Zach. of Myt. VII.4, Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 814, and Elias of Nisibis 814. See Christensen (1944) 341–342 for a justification of Kavadh's actions.

⁹⁹ There is some evidence in the *Annals* of Eutychius 132, concerning a Persian attack on Alexandria during the Amidan siege: he records that the Persian army destroyed everything in their path to Alexandria and that many Persians and Romans died in battles there; cf. Jarry (1966) 197. Such an expedition is highly unlikely, both because of geographical reasons and because there is no mention of it in any other source, Byzantine or Egyptian. It is probable that Eutychius confused Egyptian Alexandria with Alexandretta near the Issus. Later when the Romans were investing Amida, they took provisions from this Alexandretta, so it is likely the Persians did too, and this is what has confused Eutychius. For this argument, see Jarry (1966) *passim*, followed by Blockley (1992) 90; cf. Capizzi (1969) 181, with n.357.

¹⁰⁰ The Lakhmids also carried off eighteen thousand, five hundred captives; it was vintage season and many were caught outside fortified cities; cf. Josh. 52 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 57–59 with notes and Cyril of Scyth. *Vit.Ioh.* 13, 211.15–19 with Greatrex and Lieu (2002) 71.

¹⁰¹ For further details, see Merten (1906) 175–176, Greatrex (1998) 87–88, Trombley and Watt (2000) 56–57 with notes; *PLRE* II.417, Eugenius 6.

¹⁰² There is some dispute over the identity of this Theodosiopolis, but it was undoubtedly the Armenian Theodosiopolis captured at the outset of the campaign. See the discussions in Stein (1949) II.94, Capizzi (1969) 181–182, *PLRE* II.417 and Greatrex (1998) 89, n.47.

¹⁰³ *Proc. de Aed.* III.5.4–12 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 59, n.283.

of Amida, constituted the first main phase of the war. The second stage of the conflict, the Roman army's response and first offensive forays into Persian territory, may be examined with reference to Anastasius' overall military strategy, which included an element of diplomatic endeavour as well as the despatch of a Roman force under the joint leadership of Areobindus, Patricius and Hypatius. Initially, Anastasius' diplomatic response was to send the ambassador, Rufinus, to offer money and peace terms to Kavadh. Rufinus, though, did not reach the Persian army until it was on its way to Amida, and he was detained there by Kavadh until the fall of the city before being sent back to Anastasius as the bearer of unwelcome tidings.¹⁰⁴ However, by this time, news of the Persian incursions had reached Constantinople, and Anastasius had already arranged for the despatch of troops to garrison the vulnerable eastern cities over the winter months. This move prevented any more successful surprise attacks of cities, and left him time to raise a much larger army for the beginning of the summer, when campaigning would begin in earnest.¹⁰⁵ The size of the army is disputed, varying from fifteen thousand to fifty-two thousand.¹⁰⁶ Marcellinus' figure of fifteen thousand seems far too small in the light of Procopius' statement that this was the largest force ever assembled; later Procopius refers to an army of thirty thousand in the 540s.¹⁰⁷ It has been calculated that the quantities of wheat for the Roman army referred to by Joshua would feed an army of between thirty-two thousand, five hundred and forty thousand for six months, a figure much closer to Joshua's own claim.¹⁰⁸ Areobindus was the *magister militum per Orientem* and Patricius and Hypatius, the emperor's nephew, were the *magistri militum praesentales*; and subordinate officers included Justin (the future emperor), Patriciolus and his son Vitalian (the future rebel), Romanus and the Lazican, Pharesmanes.¹⁰⁹ The prefect Apion was also despatched, to be stationed at Edessa in

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Trombley and Watt (2000) 53, n.256, 257.

¹⁰⁵ According to Procopius *B.P.* I.8.1, Anastasius only sent a force when he heard that Amida was under siege. Joshua's account (54) of a more gradual deployment is the much more likely scenario. Although he had initially offered Kavadh a financial incentive not to invade the empire, Anastasius refused a demand for money after the fall of Amida; such a payment would be an admission of defeat; cf. Greatrex (1998) 94.

¹⁰⁶ Marc. C. 503, fifteen thousand, contra Joshua 54, fifty-two thousand (forty thousand with Hypatius and Patricius, and twelve thousand with Areobindus).

¹⁰⁷ *Proc. B.P.* II.24.16.

¹⁰⁸ Josh. 54; cf. Jones (1964) 231–232, Howard-Johnston (1995) 166, Greatrex (1998) 33, 96, n.69 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 65, n.310.

¹⁰⁹ *Proc. B.P.* I.8.1–3, Zach. of Myt. VII.4, John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.53 and Theoph. AM 5997.

charge of provisions for the army.¹¹⁰

In the light of the reported disagreements between Areobindus, Patricius and Hypatius, Anastasius has often been criticised both for splitting the command and for his choice of generals.¹¹¹ Looking to his recent success in the Isaurian war, however, Anastasius could argue the benefits of a joint command which had resulted in a victory. As to the individuals, in theory they were of impeccable character and background. Areobindus was the great-grandson of Aspar, and, through marriage to Anicia Juliana, was the son-in-law of the western emperor, Olybrius; and indeed, it appears that his integrity and actions during the war were often distorted to show him in an unfavourable light. After all, not only did Anastasius bestow upon him the title of honorary consul in 506, but the Constantinopolitan mob called upon him to become emperor in 512, in place of Anastasius. It seems unlikely that they would have favoured a disgraced general in such a way.¹¹² Patricius too was an obvious choice. He had been a consul in 500, and despite the reverses of the Roman army under his command, he was not recalled to Constantinople with Hypatius. That he was still trusted after the war by Anastasius is evident from the important missions delegated to him. In 512 he was sent with Celer to pacify the crowds during the Trishagion riots, and in 514 he was sent as an envoy to Vitalian.¹¹³ It is perhaps the appointment of his nephew, Hypatius, which has been most criticised.¹¹⁴ However, again Anastasius would have had his reasons: Hypatius had been consul in 500 with Patricius and there is some evidence that he had military experience from fighting against the Isaurians.¹¹⁵ As the war went against the Romans, Anastasius perhaps thought it prudent to recall Hypatius to avoid any accusations of favouritism, but clearly thought him sufficiently qualified to appoint him against Vitalian at a later date. Furthermore, such a selection of high-standing and even imperially connected generals was designed to intimidate the

Persians, and Hypatius, as a close relative, could be seen as a direct representative of the emperor on the battlefield.

An account of the Roman military campaign of 503 reveals the reluctance of the generals to coordinate their efforts, but also highlights the successful military strategy pursued by Areobindus, especially at Edessa, and his concern not to yield to financial requests from Kavadh; thus reflecting the overall strategy of the Anastasian government as seen in the pre-war negotiations. Operations began in May with several victories for Areobindus near Nisibis, to which he laid siege.¹¹⁶ The Persians, though, quickly gained the upper hand with the help of the Hephthalites and Arabs led by the deserter Constantine, and Areobindus withdrew. He sent for help from Patricius and Hypatius who were engaged in besieging the Persians at Amida. They refused, it is claimed by Theophanes, to send support out of jealousy.¹¹⁷ Such an analysis is, however, most probably a distortion of events, coloured by later developments. By the time Areobindus' summons for assistance reached them, the siege towers were prepared for the climax of the investment and it is hardly surprising that they would be reluctant to leave Amida. As Joshua wrote: "When at great expense the construction of the towers had been completed, ... the news reached them of what had happened on the border. They (therefore) set fire to the towers and left there, giving chase to the Persians but not catching them".¹¹⁸ The failure of Patricius and Hypatius to reach Areobindus in time, forcing him to abandon his camp at Apadna and flee to Constantia and Edessa, caused bad feeling between the generals. Ironically, though, the absence of Hypatius and Patricius had some positive benefits for the progress of the siege. The Persians grew careless, making expeditions into the countryside for plunder; and on one such occasion, the Persian commander, Glon, was ambushed by Pharesmanes and captured. He was later executed by the Roman generals when the garrison refused to come to terms.¹¹⁹

Meanwhile, Kavadh decided to advance westwards from Nisibis, but he found the three generals blocking his route: Areobindus barred the

¹¹⁰ On Apion, see Stein (1949) II.95, Capizzi (1969) 182, Greatrex (1996) 128, Trombley and Watt (2000) 65, n.312, *PLRE* II.111, Apion 2.

¹¹¹ Cf. Greatrex (1998) 75–76. It is notable that much of the direct criticism comes from those authors writing during the reign of Justinian with a vested interest in down-playing any success of the Anastasian generals, e.g. John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.53 who describes Areobindus as inept and fond of dancing and music, and Patricius and Hypatius as cowardly and inexperienced.

¹¹² *PLRE* II.143–144, Areobindus 1, Greatrex (1996) 127–128, Trombley and Watt (2000) 65–309.

¹¹³ Cf. *PLRE* II.840–842, Patricius 4, Greatrex (1996) 125f.

¹¹⁴ *PLRE* II.577–581, Hypatius 6, Greatrex (1996) *passim*.

¹¹⁵ Mich. Syr. IX.11. There is also a suggestion that he might have taken part in skirmishes against the Bulgars in the 490s; cf. Prisc. *Pan.* 299–300, with Cameron (1974) 313–315.

¹¹⁶ According to Zach. of Myt. VII.4, Areobindus attacked Amida first with Patricius and Hypatius before his action on Persian territory; cf. Greatrex (1998) 97, n.71. The initial success of Areobindus with only twelve thousand troops against the twenty thousand strong Persian force belies the critical accounts of his generalship.

¹¹⁷ Theoph. AM 5997; cf. Trombley and Watt (2000) 66–67, n.317.

¹¹⁸ Josh. 56 (tr. Trombley and Watt) with Trombley and Watt (2000) 67–68, n.322.

¹¹⁹ See Zach. of Myt. VII.5, Proc. B.P. I.9.5–19 and Josh. 56, and the discussion by Merten (1906) 149ff, Greatrex (1998) 98–99, and Trombley and Watt (2000) 68, n.324 who believe that there were two separate similar incidents, one related by Joshua, and a second involving Glon, as related by Zachariah and Procopius.

road to Constantia and Edessa, while Patricius and Hypatius obstructed his path to Amida.¹²⁰ Again, however, the three did not coordinate their movements and while the latter two remained in place, Areobindus retreated to Constantia.¹²¹ In the ensuing battle between Patricius and Hypatius and the Persians, it seems that the Romans were initially successful in killing an advance party of Hephthalites, but lack of caution thereafter brought defeat upon them.¹²² Following the skirmish with the Huns, they relaxed, preparing lunch and bathing in a stream. Thus, off their guard, they were surprised by the Persians and defeated.¹²³ By August, the Roman army had withdrawn across the Euphrates to Samosata, while Areobindus retired to Edessa.

Kavadh followed the latter, stopping briefly to make an attempt on the city of Constantia. After the failure of a plot by the Jews to betray the city, he was persuaded to depart, as much by the inhospitality of the terrain as by a gift from the citizens.¹²⁴ He marched on to Edessa and settled down to besiege it at the beginning of September, 503, but after a short time initiated negotiations.¹²⁵ Areobindus, suspecting treachery, was very wary of setting up a meeting with the Persian embassy either inside or outside the city.¹²⁶ Eventually, he met with the envoy, Bawi, who demanded for the Persians ten thousand pounds of gold and an additional sum of gold every year, another example of Kavadh's aim of financial gain throughout the expedition. Areobindus refused and offered a one-off payment of seven thousand pounds of gold.¹²⁷ At the breakdown of negotiations, Kavadh turned his attention to the surrounding area, despatching contingents of Persians and Hephthalites to Carrhae, and Lakhmids to Batnae. Both ventures were unsuccessful: the leader of the Huns was captured by the garrison at Carrhae, and the

Arabs, after initial success, were defeated by forces under Patriciolus and Vitalian.¹²⁸ As the Roman army regrouped at Samosata, Kavadh decided to make a renewed effort against Edessa, but withdrew hurriedly after a minor sortie by a few Edessans. His demand for hostages, the return of prisoners of war, and seven thousand pounds of gold, was met with an offer of the *comes* Basil as a hostage, fourteen Persian captives, and two thousand pounds of gold to be paid after twelve days.¹²⁹ Kavadh agreed, but the next day he demanded the money immediately.

The conduct of Areobindus at Edessa is not that of an inept general, as the widespread criticism levelled at his leadership would suggest. On the approach of the Persians, he had organised the destruction of buildings lying outside the city walls and brought the holy relics into the city; he was shrewd in his suspicion of Persian treachery before the talks with Bawi; and he managed to reduce the Persian demands for gold. After Kavadh's last request for immediate payment, he claimed back the hostage Basil and accused the king: "Now we know that you are not a (real) king, for a king does not give his word and then falsely go back on it. He who plays false is no king ...".¹³⁰ Further assaults on the city were unsuccessful, and so Kavadh departed, going south to the Euphrates and to Lower Mesopotamia.¹³¹ On the whole, the first year of the war had not rendered the financial gain and military glory he had hoped for: the capture of Amida was his one major achievement. Despite his superior forces, he had been unable to force Areobindus into open battle and failed, both by diplomacy and by force, to benefit from the vast riches of Edessa.¹³² Although the Roman generals had failed to take the initiative, they had managed to halt Kavadh's advances, and some limited progress had been made with offensive forays into Persian territory led by Areobindus and Patricius.

This record was to be greatly improved in the second campaigning season of the war and was characterised by two important actions by Anastasius:¹³³ he arranged for significant economic aid to be given to

¹²⁰ Proc. *B.P.* I.8.10.

¹²¹ It is possible to see Areobindus' withdrawal as prudent, given that he still had only twelve thousand troops and, as Procopius writes, Kavadh was marching against him παντι τῷ στρατῷ (Proc. *B.P.* I.8.11).

¹²² See Merten (1906) 179–180 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 70, n.331 for discussion of the different sources and versions of this episode.

¹²³ It was in this engagement that the Lakhmid, al-Numan, was wounded, supposedly as a result of his blasphemous suggestion that Kavadh should besiege the "blessed" city of Edessa, and died a few days later; Josh. 58, with Segal (1970) 112. Procopius *B.P.* II.12.26 relates the story of the letter from Jesus promising the prince of Edessa, Abgar, recovery from gout and eternal freedom for the city; cf. Greatrex (1998) 106, n. 93.

¹²⁴ Cf. Josh. 58 with Merten (1906) 180ff, Greatrex (1998) 101–103 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 72, n. 343.

¹²⁵ On the defences of Edessa, see Greatrex (1998) 41.

¹²⁶ Josh. 59.

¹²⁷ Greatrex (1998) 104 points out that the terms offered by Kavadh and refused by Areobindus were "remarkably similar" to those accepted by Justinian less than thirty years later.

¹²⁸ Cf. Greatrex (1998), 104f.

¹²⁹ Josh. 61; for a discussion on hostage-taking, see Lee (1991) 371, Greatrex (1998) 105.

¹³⁰ Josh. 61 (tr. Trombley and Watt), with Trombley and Watt (2000) 80, n.383.

¹³¹ See Greatrex (1998) 106. Kavadh's retreat south to Lower Mesopotamia took him past Batnae, which surrendered, and Callinicum, which he unsuccessfully attacked, cf. Josh. 61–65.

¹³² For a summary of the achievements (and failures) of both sides in the first year of the war, Greatrex (1998) 107; contra Capizzi (1969) 182–183 who sees Kavadh as returning in triumph to Persia from Edessa with two thousand pounds of gold, but this is nothing compared to his original demand.

¹³³ In late 503 / early 504 the new Lakhmid chief, al-Mundhir, attacked Palestina Prima and Arabia. The raid was well timed as Romanus, the *dux* of Palestine, was away

the suffering frontier population, and in order to improve the efficiency and coordination of the army, he made certain changes to the command structure. In the late summer of 503, the *magister officiorum*, Celer, was sent out as supreme commander of the army.¹³⁴ Hypatius was recalled and later replaced by Pharesmanes, while Calliopius took up Apion's role.¹³⁵ Again the Roman command was split and a three-pronged campaign was mounted.¹³⁶ Celer invaded Arzanene, Areobindus made inroads into Persarmenia and Patricius continued to besiege Amida. The army benefited from the substantial reinforcements sent by Anastasius with Celer, and they were encouraged by the worsening conditions for the besieged Persian garrison at Amida.¹³⁷ In the first of a series of economic aid packages, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene were similarly heartened by Anastasius' cancellation of their taxes.¹³⁸

The 504 campaigning season was marked by disappointment for Kavadh who was at no time able to reassert Persian supremacy. Indeed, the garrison's continued resistance against the Roman siege of Amida appeared to be the only Persian success. Early in the year, Patricius destroyed a market set up outside Amida, killing the merchants and, after retreating to the Nymphius (a tributary of the Tigris), defeating a force of Persians sent by Kavadh.¹³⁹ Patricius then settled down to besiege Amida while the main army under Celer was stationed at Resaina (Mesopotamian Theodosiopolis).¹⁴⁰ Kavadh tried to send another force to prise the besieging army away from Amida but was unsuccessful, his

fighting in Mesopotamia; on the dating, Shahid (1995) 26–28 and on the success of the venture, Greatrex (1998) 107, n. 97.

¹³⁴ For further details on Celer, Greatrex (1996) 126f and (1998) 108, n.98.

¹³⁵ Josh. 70 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 88, n.422–423; for more details on Calliopius, Mathison (1986) 49 and Croke (1984) 83ff and *PLRE* II.252, no.5.

¹³⁶ Bury (1923), II.13 commented “the evils of a divided command had been realized”, although the command was again split. That there was no sensationalism over the recall of Hypatius can be inferred from Joshua (70), who does not even mention the episode. Moreover, it seems certain that his version in which Apion is sent to Alexandria to organise supplies there, should be favoured over Theophanes' account (AM 5998), in which both Apion and Hypatius were recalled. Proc. B.P. I.9.1 wrongly states that Areobindus was recalled. On Celer, see *PLRE* II.275ff, no.2 and Greatrex (1998) 108.

¹³⁷ Josh. 64 on Celer's reinforcements (with Greatrex (1998) 108, n.99), and 76 on the famine at Amida. See also Proc. B.P. I.9.1–3.

¹³⁸ Josh. 66 on the edict of 25th December, 503, with Segal (1970) 121, Greatrex (1998) 109, n.101 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 83, n.401.

¹³⁹ Josh. 66. For details of Patricius' retreat from Amida and subsequent victory at the Nymphius, see Greatrex (1998) 109–110, with n.102 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 84–85, n.406–407.

¹⁴⁰ Roman morale was apparently boosted by the discovery of a miraculous egg foretelling a Roman victory; Josh. 67–68.

path blocked by Celer.¹⁴¹ The Persian king himself could not press the issue, as he had left the scene to deal with an invasion of the Sabir Huns in the Caucasus.¹⁴² At the same time, Celer ordered the *dux* Timostratus to capture the livestock of the Persian army at Nisibis, before joining Patricius at Amida.¹⁴³ Here the Romans enjoyed some success in tunnelling under both the outer and inner city walls, but the joyful cry of an Amidene woman, “Look, the Romans are coming into the city!”, alerted the Persians, who forced the attackers back.¹⁴⁴ Thwarted again, Celer left Patricius to maintain the siege, while he turned his attentions to other operations. Areobindus led an incursion into Persarmenia, not only causing much damage, but also encouraging the desertion of one Armenian chief from Persia to Rome.¹⁴⁵ Again, Nisibis almost fell to the Romans who defeated part of the Persian garrison.¹⁴⁶ During the winter of 504–505, Celer himself led an expedition into Persian territory, plundering and killing all males over the age of twelve.¹⁴⁷ As a complement to this military action, Anastasius gave further encouragement to the towns of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene with the cancellation of taxes for another year; and the inhabitants of Hierapolis had their payments reduced by a third.¹⁴⁸

However, by now the Romans were suffering the same hardships of besieging a city during winter that the Persians had undergone the previous year. They were therefore not averse to negotiations for peace with Kavadh. As for the Persian king, there were several reasons why he was desirous of ending the war he had initiated. The main object of his offensive had been financial gain, but he had nothing to gain now his advantage had been lost and Persia was being successfully plundered by the Romans. Moreover, occupied as he was with the invasion of the Huns, he could not give his full attention to the Romans. These reasons, coupled with the realization that the garrison in Amida could not hold out much longer and that negotiation would bear more fruit than surrender, induced Kavadh to send the Persian *spahbadh* to return

¹⁴¹ Greatrex (1998) 110 for further details.

¹⁴² For a summary of the argument over which type of Huns was involved (Hephthalite or Sabir), see Greatrex (1998) 110, n.104. On the Sabir Huns, Howarth (1892) 613–616. Kavadh may also have had to deal with a revolt of the “Kadousioi”, Greatrex (1998) 111.

¹⁴³ *PLRE* II.1119–1120, Timostratus.

¹⁴⁴ Josh. 71 (tr. Trombley and Watt). For the plight of the Amidenes during the siege, and for further details of fighting around Amida, Greatrex (1998) 111–112.

¹⁴⁵ Josh. 75 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 92, n.440, 93, n.442–443.

¹⁴⁶ Josh. 75 and Theoph. AM 5998; cf. Greatrex (1998) 113, with n.113.

¹⁴⁷ Josh. 79, Marc. C. 504, Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 816, Theoph. AM 5998, with Greatrex (1998) 113–114 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 95–97 with notes 450–454.

¹⁴⁸ Josh. 78, with Trombley and Watt (2000) 95, n.448–449.

Roman hostages and propose peace, on condition that the safety of the Amida garrison would be assured. Celer and the Romans cunningly outwitted the *spahbadh* over the matter of provisions for the garrison, but Celer could not rally the Roman troops, and was forced to agree to the terms and the surrender of Amida for a sum of money.¹⁴⁹

Anastasius conducted the end of the war with consideration for the strategy he had pursued throughout: principally to avoid handing over to Kavadh the economic resources he needed, but to use financial aid for the benefit of the Romans living in the areas most affected by the war. The truce was eventually concluded in November, 506.¹⁵⁰ The actual terms of the agreement are not clear. Procopius refers to a seven-year peace treaty, and John the Lydian refers to moderate payments offered by Anastasius. It is apparent that these were one-off payments. There is no evidence for annual subsidies and, as the Romans were in a stronger position during the peace talks than the Persians, it is unlikely that Anastasius would have agreed to any regular payments.¹⁵¹ Moreover, if the estimated payment was only in the region of one thousand pounds of gold, compared with the eleven thousand paid by Justinian for the Eternal Peace in 532, such a low figure highlights Anastasius' success in ensuring that Kavadh gained little financial benefit or prestige from the war. It is also possible that the treaty did not allow for fresh fortification work in the vicinity of the frontier, an agreement likely to have been accepted by the Romans, as a great deal of repair and restoration work was already well under way as well as the new fortress of Dara.¹⁵²

The war now over, Anastasius continued to look after the welfare, and reward the loyalty, of the war-torn frontier provinces. Before the signing of the truce, he again cancelled taxes throughout Mesopotamia and sent Urbicius, the former *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, to Amida and Edessa to distribute largesse. These payments were partly in acknowledgement of the bad behaviour of the soldiers, particularly the Goths,

¹⁴⁹ The generals swore that they would allow supplies to reach the Persians in Amida, but these supplies (along with concealed weapons) were intercepted by the *dux* Nonnosus, who had purposely been absent when the agreement was struck with the Persians. On the sum of money agreed: Zach. of Myt. VII.5 — 1100 pounds of gold; Proc. *B.P.* I.9.4 — 1000 pounds; Theoph. AM 5998 — 3 (or 30) talents; Marc. C. 503 records "a large amount of gold" (*inmensa dehinc auri pondere*); Josh. 81 mentions gifts rather than a sum of gold; cf. Trombley and Watt (2000) 99, n.466. See Greatrex (1998) 114–115 with n. 120 for a detailed discussion of the negotiations.

¹⁵⁰ See Josh. 97, with Merten (1906) 196, for suspicions of treachery during the negotiations; and Greatrex (1998) 117.

¹⁵¹ Greatrex (1998) 117–118, contra Stein (1949) II.99ff, Capizzi (1969) 184, and Blockley (1985) 68.

¹⁵² Cf. Greatrex (1998) 117, and for further discussion, see below.

billeted in the cities; the stationing of Celer's army at Edessa from April to September, 506, while the general waited for a successor for Bawi who had died, also caused much suffering and complaints.¹⁵³ Even after the treaty had been ratified, Anastasius instructed Celer and Calliopius to carry out a review of the economic situation in the east, and "they considered that the entire *synteleia* [tax] should be written off for the territory of the Amidenes, and half of it for the territory of the Edessenes". Celer himself gave the governor of Edessa a sum of money to distribute in presents to the citizens.¹⁵⁴

The Eastern Defensive Building Programme

As soon as initial negotiations at Amida had been concluded, Anastasius turned his attention to restoring the battered defences of the eastern cities. The problem, however, in assessing his contribution to the improvement of frontier fortifications is well known. Much of the evidence comes from the *de Aedificiis* in which Procopius is seeking to emphasise the achievements of Justinian. It is probable, therefore, that he exaggerates and embellishes the latter's achievements at the expense of Anastasius, although it is impossible to know precisely to what extent Anastasius does suffer by comparison. The archaeological evidence at many sites is unclear; there are few sixth-century imperial building inscriptions, and no particular development of technique, making it very hard to distinguish one phase from another.¹⁵⁵

It is nevertheless possible, with caution, to construct an outline of Anastasius' work on these defences.¹⁵⁶ As noted above, Theodosiopolis was strengthened and provided with new walls, thirty feet in height.¹⁵⁷ General improvements to the fortifications were made at Citharizon and Melitene,¹⁵⁸ and the walls at Europus were upgraded.¹⁵⁹ It is un-

¹⁵³ See Josh. 92 and Zach. of Myt. VII.5 for the remission of tax, and Josh. 93–96 on the behaviour of the soldiers. For further details, see Segal (1970) 160–162 and Greatrex (1998) 115–116. On the economic consequences to Edessa of the Arab raiding and the Persian war generally, see also Leclainche (1980) 96–97 and passim. On Urbicius' donations, Trombley and Watt (2000) 101, n.476.

¹⁵⁴ Josh. 99–100 (tr. Trombley and Watt). The economy of the eastern cities had suffered, not only from the constant raiding, but from the demographic loss (cf. Trombley (1997) 169).

¹⁵⁵ E.g. Croke and Crow (1983) contra Whitby (1984), (1986a) and (1986b).

¹⁵⁶ See above on Anastasius' contribution to Resafa.

¹⁵⁷ Proc. *de Aed.* III.4.1–9, though he plays down the importance of Anastasius' contribution; cf. Capizzi (1969) 206–207.

¹⁵⁸ Proc. *de Aed.* III.4.19, with Howard-Johnston (1989) 218–219, Greatrex (1998) 122, n.8.

¹⁵⁹ Josh. 91, with Capizzi (1969) 214.

certain if there was any repair work carried out at Amida. It may be that none was necessary as the walls had successfully withstood the sieges of both Persians and Romans. Entry into Amida was gained through secret passages rather than by the destruction of the walls. However, there is some evidence to suggest that Anastasius financed ■ bridge over the Tigris.¹⁶⁰ South of the Tur 'Abdin, at sites such as Batnae, BIRTHA, and Edessa, Anastasius encouraged local initiative in repairing or constructing fortifications with the backing of imperial funds.¹⁶¹ Eulogius, the governor of Edessa, was entrusted with the rebuilding of the wall of the fortress at Batnae, as well as with reconstruction work at Edessa, for which Anastasius gave him two hundred pounds of gold. He was also allocated twenty pounds for the repair of the city wall and other expenses.¹⁶² In these situations responsibility often passed to the bishop. An inscription of 506/507 notes the contribution of the bishop of Anasarthra who erected ■ fortress at Bouz el-Khanzir.¹⁶³ At Rasa el-Būz in Syria Prima an inscription records the fortification work carried out by the bishop Stephen (of Gabbula?), dated to 10th November, 506.¹⁶⁴ There are also examples of individual patronage of local fortification programmes. An inscription from one of a group of defensive towers erected at Taroutia (Kerrāṭīn) in Syria Secunda in c.509/510 attests to the generosity of a certain John in providing this protection for the villagers: "He who in the emperor's business has proved a faithful servant in toils, John, has made this guardhouse secure, a defence of safety in this region, being son of Azizos by name, brother of Paul".¹⁶⁵ Another inscription carved on the lintel of a second tower also bears evidence of the activity of John: "Thus wisely guarding his

¹⁶⁰ It is also thought that Anastasius was responsible for providing the necessary funding to enable the bishop, John, to construct the Church of the Forty Martyrs at Amida in 512; cf. Capizzi (1969) 215–216 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 101, n.475.

¹⁶¹ The fortress of Thannuris, also in this area, is assigned by Michael the Syrian to Anastasius. It was already in existence at the start of the Anastasian war, so it is likely that improvements were made at this time; cf. Capizzi (1969) 223–224, Greatrex (1998) 122, n.7.

¹⁶² On Batnae, Josh. 89, and on Edessa, Josh. 87, with Capizzi (1969) 224–225, Trombley (1997) 16, Greatrex (1998) 41 and Trombley and Watt (2000) 106, n.494, 498. Anastasius gave "a considerable sum of money" to the bishop of BIRTHA, Sergius, for the erection of a defensive wall; Josh. 91 with Trombley and Watt (2000) 110–11, n.514.

¹⁶³ Cf. Trombley (1997) 187.

¹⁶⁴ *JGLS* II.151f; Capizzi (1969) 226.

¹⁶⁵ ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως πραγμάτων Ἰωάννης πιστ[ὸς] πεφυκὼς ἐν πόνοις ὑπέρτης, τοῦτι πεποίηκεν ἀ[σ]σαλῆς τὸ φρούριον, σωτηρίας ἐπαλξιν ἐν τοῖς χωρίοις, υἱὸς γενόμενος Ἀζίζου τοῦ ὄνομα. Παύλου ἀδελφός, ... (Prentice (1922) 80, no.993; tr. Greatrex (2002) 241).

country, John, abounding in good counsels, supplying the gold unsparingly, provides a tower, a place of safety for (his) friends, through the effort of Paul, (the) deacon, in (the) year 821 (AD 509/510), in (the) name of God (the) Saviour".¹⁶⁶ The identity of this John is unknown but it is probable that he was a local landowner, village official or even the presbyter of the local church, which would certainly fit the above pattern of the responsibility for defence increasingly devolving to the Church.¹⁶⁷

Further south in Phoenicia, work was carried out on the citadel at Emesa as a precaution against Arab raids,¹⁶⁸ and in Palestina Tertia frontier fortresses destroyed in the incursions of the 490s were repaired.¹⁶⁹ Fortresses on the Red Sea which served to protect imperial economic interests in this area, against both the Arab threat and piracy, as discussed above, were also strengthened.¹⁷⁰ It is also possible that there was some building activity at the site of Zenobia/Halebiya in 505/6. Procopius accepts only the 545 phase, but differences in the construction of the walls, the east church and certain roads would suggest an earlier stage. He himself admits that the Persians bypassed Zenobia during the Justinianic war after failing to force the city to surrender, suggesting that the walls were not in such disrepair as implied in the *de Aedificiis*.¹⁷¹

Anastasius' major contribution to the defences of the eastern provinces was his fortification of Dara, although again it is not clear exactly what proportion of the work was planned and carried out by Anastasius and what by Justinian.¹⁷² It is certain that the major

¹⁶⁶ ὡς σοφῶς τὴν πατρίδα φρουρῶν, Ἰωάννης ἀγαθοῖς βουλευμασιν βρύων, ἀφειδῶς ἐκπονῶν τὸ χρυσίον, πύργον κομίζει τοῖς φίλοις σωτήριον, σπουδῇ Παύλου διακ(όνου). ἐν ἔτι ακω', ἐν ὀνόματι θε(ε)ῦ Σωτῆρος (Prentice (1908) 79f, no.992, with Butler (1920) 75; tr. Greatrex (2002) 241).

¹⁶⁷ On the identity of John, Prentice (1908) 81 and Trombley (1997) 161ff. The cathedral of Taroutia has an inscription of 504/5, most likely marking repair work; Butler (1920) 73–81, Prentice (1908) 76ff, Liebeschuetz (1977) 493.

¹⁶⁸ *JGLS* V.2204, Capizzi (1969) 225–226 and Greatrex (1998) 122, n.7.

¹⁶⁹ John of Nikiu LXXXIX.93; Capizzi (1969) 225.

¹⁷⁰ John of Nikiu LXXXIX.93; Capizzi (1969) 229.

¹⁷¹ Proc. *B.P.* II.5.4–7 and *de Aed.* II.8.8–9, Gregory (1997) 140–146 and Lauffrat (1983) 140–1 who suggests that Anastasius may also have been responsible for a church and baptistery.

¹⁷² On Dara, Evag. III.37 following Malalas, Procopius and an unknown source. Evagrius' account is close to that of Zachariah's (VII.6). It has been suggested that they were both using similar local traditions from Amida which, being close to Dara, was probably used as the headquarters for building operations. See further, Allen (1981) 157 and Ensslin (1927) passim. For the entry by Marcellinus *Comes*, see Croke (1984) and (1995) 121. Details are also found in the *Chron Pasch.* 498, Niceph. Call. XVI.37,

deficiency of the Roman defensive system, apart from the dilapidated state of individual forts, was the absence of a strong base on the border from which to launch attacks into Persian territory. The capture of Nisibis in 363 had forced the base for the Roman defence of Mesopotamia back to Amida, sixty miles behind the frontier and at Constantia, similarly far from any line of action and rather small and weak.¹⁷³ Towards the end of the campaign the Roman generals complained to Anastasius that it was almost impossible to wage war along the frontier against the secure Persian base of Nisibis, when they had no base of their own to attack from, or retreat to. The sites of Ammudis and Dara were examined for their suitability, and the latter was selected because of its good water supply and naturally defensive position on three hills.

Zachariah of Mytilene gives a very precise account of the organisation of the funding of the new city:

And the king [Anastasius] gave gold to Thomas the bishop [of Amida] as the price of the village [the site of Dara] which belonged to the church; and he bought it for the treasury. And he liberated all the serfs who were in it, and granted to each of them his land and his house ...¹⁷⁴

Such generosity to previous inhabitants would secure their loyalty, imperative at such an important border post. Moreover, to ensure that the fortifications were secured as quickly as possible before Kavadh's attention was freed from the Huns, Anastasius made sure that the workers were always paid well and on time. This guaranteed a large and eager work force which performed diligently, and as Zachariah records,

Consequently, many [of these craftsmen] grew rich and wealthy ... from the east to the west workmen and craftsmen flocked together. And the overseers [clergymen from Aleppo] who were over the work also received a liberal allowance and their wallets were filled.¹⁷⁵

The Persians were generally too occupied with the Huns to do much more than issue verbal protests, although skirmishing parties were sent

and the chronography of Bar Hebraeus, *The Legend of the Building of Dara*. For modern scholarship on Dara, see Croke and Crow (1983), Whitby (1986b) and (2000) 182, n.141–142, Gregory (1997) 80–88, Greatrex (1998) 120–121 and (2002) 74–77.

¹⁷³ The frontier fortress of Circesium on the Euphrates was abandoned as a strategic defensive centre when the *legio quarta Parthica* was transferred to Beroea and Callinicum, which became the seat of the *dux* of Osrhoene.

¹⁷⁴ Zach. of Myt. VII.6, quoted by Mundell (1975) 219.

¹⁷⁵ Zach. of Myt. VII.6 quoted by Mundell (1975) 223. Anastasius was successful in ensuring the work was carried out quickly. By 507/8 the circuit walls had been completed and thus afforded protection to the builders still working on the civilian and ecclesiastical structures.

out from Nisibis. To counter this, the Romans moved a unit under Pharesmanes to Amida from Edessa to offer protection to the workers. It is said that Dara took two to three years to build, and comprised not only strong defences, but also public baths, cisterns, storehouses, porticoes, and statues of Anastasius.¹⁷⁶ Dara grew in importance, becoming the seat of the *dux* of Mesopotamia, and was renamed Anastasiopolis.¹⁷⁷

Anastasius did not neglect the spiritual needs of the new city, which was given the status of a metropolis and was a monophysite stronghold until 519. Initially, Dara came under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Amida and the bishop, Thomas, was involved in the planning of the city. The emperor gave Thomas “several hundred pounds of gold” and later to the presbyter of Dara, Eutychie, “he gave holy vessels and gold for the building of the Great Church”.¹⁷⁸ From the account of Procopius, we know that there were two churches at Dara, St. Bartholomew's and the Great Church. Inevitably, though, he claims that it was Justinian who was responsible for their building:

Furthermore, he constructed two shrines, both the Great Church, as it is called, and the Church of the Apostle Bartholomew.¹⁷⁹

However, as discussed above, Procopius' account is to some extent unreliable. In support of an Anastasian date for the churches, evidence from Theodore Lector can be cited, who reports that Anastasius sent the relics of St. Bartholomew from Cyprus to Dara.¹⁸⁰ The carving of a funerary relief depicting Ezekiel on the façade of a tomb cut into the quarries to the west of Dara may also be of some significance. The carving of the archivolt of the tomb is very similar to that on the north gate of the city walls and on the tetraconch at Resafa (see above, p. 39). The cycle of Ezekiel was often seen as foreshadowing the General Resurrection, and it therefore makes sense if the relief belonged to the period of Dara's foundation, the beginning of the sixth century, the time of the anticipated Second Coming. The image may be compared with the aniconic nature of the mosaics at the Jacobite monastery of

¹⁷⁶ The Roman *hyparch*, Calliopius, was placed in charge of the building work. It is claimed by Marc. C. 518 that he even traced out the perimeter of the city with a hoe, in the traditional manner.

¹⁷⁷ Marc. C. 518 claimed that Dara retained its old name; see the discussion in Capizzi (1969) 217, Croke (1984) 84–85, and Palmer (1990a) 149.

¹⁷⁸ Zach. of Myt. VII.6, quoted by Mundell (1975) 219.

¹⁷⁹ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱερὰ πεποιήται δύο, τὴν τε μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν καλουμένην καὶ τὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου βαρβολομαίου ναόν. Proc. *de Aed.* II.3.26 (tr. Dewing).

¹⁸⁰ Theod. Lect. 558, Niceph. Call. XVI.37. It was believed that St. Bartholomew came to Anastasius in a dream offering to protect the city.

Qartmin. If the relief at Dara was specifically monophysite, then this demonstrates further Anastasius' influence in the doctrinal outlook of the whole city.¹⁸¹

The fortification of Dara was a major achievement for Anastasius for several reasons. Firstly, while he had previously rebuilt fairly substantial forts, the development of Dara from a small settlement into the centre of Roman eastern defence was entirely his own creation, however much altered by Justinian later. Secondly, it represented the eastern part of Anastasius' policy, as in the Balkans, of creating a defensive system close to Rome's frontier. Thirdly, unlike the other repair work which was defensive in nature, this fort was constructed as an offensive base. It placed further pressure on the Persians by forcing them to maintain two armies, one to cover the Caspian Gates against the destructive Hunnic invasions, and the other to cover Dara.¹⁸²

The Eastern Frontier 506–518

From 506 to 518, Anastasius' reign was remarkably free from trouble on the eastern front. An uprising of the Tzani who invaded Pontus in 505/6 was swiftly dealt with.¹⁸³ In 513, an uprising of the Armenians who were protesting about the Persian suppression of their religious freedom also affected Roman Armenia, while in Africa the Mazices attacked Libya and pillaged Cyreneica.¹⁸⁴ The most serious disturbance was the incursion of the Sabir Huns who poured in through the Caspian Gates in 515. Armenia, Cappadocia and Mesopotamia suffered particularly in the raids and Anastasius again responded by remitting taxes for three years and strengthening fortifications.¹⁸⁵ The town of Euchaita certainly seems to have benefited from imperial attention.¹⁸⁶ An in-

scription records the erection of a city wall, the promotion of settlement from township to city status and the foundation of a bishop's seat:

The pious emperor Anastasius who rules the world by God's decree has made into ■ city this holy spot. Happily inspired by the Martyr, he has erected a wall for the town so as to preserve inviolate in all respects the bishop's seat that he had been the first to found. He has offered God ■ worthy gift as well as a testimonial of his piety, namely the poor who have fared well [at his hands]. May the consubstantial Trinity guard him and prove him victorious in his kingdom.¹⁸⁷

A second inscription refers to the first bishop Mamas:

Christ's athlete, who is ■ citizen of heaven — Theodore, the guardian of this town, has persuaded Anastasius, the pious triumphator, to found ■ throne bearing the name of the holy mysteries. Mamas, the most-pure priest has obtained it; he constantly moves his tongue in divinely composed song while he fills this place of spiritual congregation, and attracts to himself the good-will of all men.¹⁸⁸

* * *

For Anastasius, the focus of his empire was to the east and, consequently, the safety and prosperity of these provinces were of utmost concern. It was, after all, to safeguard the loyalty of the eastern provinces that he sacrificed the opportunities of communion with the popes and the repair of the Acacian schism. One can always query the extent to which he can be held accountable for the setbacks suffered by the empire in the defence of the Persian frontier. The eastern provinces were impoverished both in fortifications and manpower when Kavadh struck in 502, the Roman commanders were uncoordinated, and Anastasius was forced to pay a sum of money for the peace treaty. It should be remembered, however, that the defensive structures had been allowed to fall into disrepair and the numbers of *limitanei* guarding the borders reduced during the fifth century when there was relative peace between Rome and Persia. Anastasius could not possibly have

¹⁸⁷ + ο ψηφω θε(ε)ου των ολων κρατων Αναστασιος ευσεβης αυτοκρατωρ τονδε τον ιερον χωρον πολιζει και το καλλιον ενπνευσθεις παρα του μαρτυρος εγρειει τω πολισματος τειχος ασυλον μεν επι πασιν την πρωτος αυτος ειδρυσεν αρχιερατικην καθεδραν τηρων αξιον δε δωρον θε(ε)ω προσενεγκας και μαρτυρας της ευσεβιας τους εν παθοντας πτωχους τουτον φυλαττοι Τριας ομοουσιος εν τοις σκηπτροις νικητην αναδικνυσσα + Mango (1972) 379–382 for text, translation and discussion.

¹⁸⁸ + ο του χ(ρισ)του αθλητης και των επουρανιων πολιτης θεοδωρος ο τουδε του πολισματος εφορος Αναστασιον πιθει τον ευσεβη τροπεουχον ειδρυσε θρονον ιερων μυστηριων επωνυμον ουπερ λαχων Μамас ο καθαροτατος μυστης κινει μεν αι τοις θεοτευκτοις ασμασιν την | γλωτταν πληρων της πνευματικης χοριας τον | δε τον τοπον ελκι δε φιλοφροσυνην ως εαυτον απαν(ων) + Mango (1972) 382–384 for text, translation and discussion.

¹⁸¹ For this interpretation of the funerary relief, Mundell (1975) 225ff. The Qartmin monastery will be discussed in greater detail in ch. 7 pp.239–241.

¹⁸² Blockley (1985) 69ff, Greatrex (1998) 121. John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.28 described the city as being "placed at the throats of the enemy"; ἦν ὁ πολὺς Ἀναστάσιος ταῖς φάρυγγι τῶν πολεμίων ἐπιτέθεικεν (tr. Carney).

¹⁸³ Theod. Lect. 466; Howard-Johnston (1989) 217–218, Greatrex (1998) 130f, n.28.

¹⁸⁴ On the Armenians, *Chronicon ad 724*, 824, Mich. Syr. IX.11, with Stein (1949) II.105, Howard-Johnston (1989) 218 and Greatrex (1998) 130, n.29; on the Mazices, John of Ant. *exc. de virt.* fr.216.

¹⁸⁵ Marc. C. 515, Mal. 406, John of Ant. fr.214e.15, Cedr. 633. On the sources, Capizzi (1969) 209–210, Mango (1972) 381. It is clear that the Huns were interested only in easy plunder and were not prepared to mount assaults against fortified defences. In the village of Kalesh the inhabitants fled to the fortress or to the monastery which was protected by walls and gate and the pillar of the stylite Saint Maro, who it is said, remained on top of his column; cf. Trombley (1997) 167, Greatrex (1998) 130, n.29. From Malalas we know that towns in Cappadocia were fortified with walls.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Trombley (1985), Greatrex (2002) 78 with n.50.

redressed the balance within the first ten years of his rule. Indeed, the improvements he had begun as soon as opportunity allowed were to continue well into the reign of Justinian. Similarly, Anastasius noted the problems caused by the disunity among the Roman generals and sought to resolve the difficulty with the appointment of one supreme commander. Finally, while there is no clear indication of the sum he agreed to pay to secure the 506 treaty, the sources give various figures for the amount paid to liberate Amida, generally in the region of one thousand pounds of gold. As discussed above, this compares favourably with the sum of eleven thousand pounds paid by Justinian for the Eternal Peace Treaty of 532.

This survey of Anastasius' foreign policy in the east has revealed an emperor not just reacting to deficiencies, misjudgements and problems whether of the past or his own reign, but an emperor actively seeking to implement new policies, new developments and new solutions in diplomatic, military, economic and religious spheres.¹⁸⁹ In particular, alliances with Arab tribes and the safeguarding of the trade routes from the east indicate Anastasius' preoccupation with preserving the frontiers of the empire by diplomacy, if at all possible, and maintaining and strengthening the state economy. These concerns are reflected again and again in imperial policy throughout the Anastasian period and can be seen in his western foreign policy, the subject of the next chapter.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Blockley (1992) 94.

4

WESTERN FOREIGN POLICY

There were two main strands in Anastasius' policy for the western regions of the empire: first, finding a resolution to the position of Theoderic, the Ostrogoth, who had been sent to rule Italy by Zeno; secondly, strengthening Roman defences in the Balkans against the frequent depredations of barbarian tribes.

I. Constantinople and 'Old Rome'

When Anastasius came to the throne Italy was disputed territory. Odoacer, the Scirian, who had seized power after a succession of puppet emperors, the so-called 'fall of Rome' in 476 and the brief reign of Romulus Augustulus, was contending for power with Theoderic, the Ostrogoth, who had been despatched to rule Italy by the emperor Zeno. Within two years Odoacer was dead, and Anastasius was left with the problem of establishing a new constitutional position for Theoderic and defining the relationship between Old and New Rome.¹ Weakness in the east Roman empire throughout the fifth century had led to a situation where an attempt to regain the west by force, as Justinian was to mastermind, was out of the question, but intervention by more

¹ A great deal has now been written on the subject of Theoderic's status in Italy as defined by Zeno and Anastasius, including general works on the period; Bury (1923) 1.453–469 and Stein (1949) II.116–119, and specific studies on Theoderic, Gaudenzi (1888) 21–38, Hodgkin (1891) 131ff, Brion (1935) 227ff, Ensslin (1947) 78–83, Jones (1962), Moorhead (1992) 35–50, and Prostko-Prostyński (1994), the only monograph to be devoted entirely to Anastasius' Gothic policy but not particularly accessible in this country. In his introduction, Prostko-Prostyński gives a detailed summary of previous work and discusses "The present state of research" (pp.21–31) and especially the views of Mommsen (pp.33–61). Prostko-Prostyński's research is thorough and deserves serious consideration but the strength of his conclusions is undermined by the fact that the study is based on a limited premise: he considers only political relations between east and west including the diplomatic, military and legal aspects, but economic, cultural and, crucially, doctrinal issues are not explored.

indirect means to retain a veneer of control was still possible. Continuous barbarian threats on the borders of the empire, both east and west, meant that the east could no longer bail out the west, and the west, now weakened by barbarian powers on the fringes, became a prize no longer worth fighting over.

The security of Italy had been under threat for some time before the beginning of the fifth century, but it was from this point that significant portions of territory were ceded and the west suffered a serious loss of prestige. The Visigoths sacked Rome in 410 and then moved on to settle in south-west Gaul and parts of Spain.² Britain was abandoned in the first decade of the century, the Vandals overran Africa, the Sueves took Spain, and the Burgundians made inroads into the east of Gaul.³ The perilous situation caused by these barbarian forces crowding on the borders of the western empire was compounded by the succession of emperors and powerful military leaders in Rome. The politics of the first half of the century were dominated by the skilful Aetius who, despite severe financial difficulties, oversaw several Roman military successes. However, after the death of Attila the Hun Valentinian III no longer saw any use for the powerful *magister militum* and had him murdered in 454. This led to his own assassination by two bodyguards of Aetius in the following March and thereafter, Rome was in the hands of the barbarian *magister militum* and patrician, Ricimer, whose role as kingmaker was taken up, after his death, by the Burgundian, Gundobad.⁴ The latter nominated Glycerius⁵ (March 473), but shortly afterwards left Rome. Without his protection, Glycerius was deposed by the army of Dalmatia who installed Julius Nepos, the nominee of Leo I.⁶ Almost within a year, however, he had fled to Dalmatia, as Orestes, *magister militum* and patrician, advanced on Ravenna and had his son crowned emperor.⁷ Economic problems, though, in Italy meant that Orestes could no longer afford to pay the army and, again within a year, the army had mutinied and Orestes had been killed by Odoacer.⁸ He entered Ravenna and had himself proclaimed king by the Goths.

Romulus Augustulus was forced to abdicate but his life was spared.⁹

But Odoacer was not king of Italy and, indeed, he seemed to harbour no ambitions to rule Italy independently. Italy remained under the sovereignty of the eastern emperor, governed by Odoacer as king of the Goths but in effect *magister militum* to the Romans. Accordingly, he returned the *ornamenta palatii*, the imperial insignia, to Constantinople as they were no longer required in Rome.¹⁰ At the same time, however, envoys from Julius Nepos arrived in Constantinople asking for sympathy, and aid, to restore Nepos to his throne. This put Zeno in something of a dilemma. He was legally obliged to support Nepos but, given the instability of the east, he could not afford to send an army large and powerful enough to defeat Odoacer's forces. Thus, Zeno compromised and left the matter vague. He instructed the senate to reinstate Nepos, and while he praised Odoacer and conferred on him the patriciate, he urged him to acknowledge Nepos. Naturally, Odoacer did not do so.¹¹ Nepos was murdered in May 480, but even with his removal from the scene, relations between Zeno and Odoacer did not improve. The emperor suspected Odoacer's involvement in the revolt of Illus, while Odoacer, encouraged by the Ostrogoths, prepared an expedition into the Balkans. A counter-assault of the Rugians against Italy, possibly instigated by Zeno, was intercepted and the Rugians defeated.¹² It was only a matter of time before Zeno would be seeking an alternative solution for the rule of Italy.

From the eastern point of view, Rome had become a burden the empire could not sustain, but could not abandon for reasons of tradition and prestige. During the fifth century, there had been attempts to render

⁹ Anon. Val. 37f, Jord. *Get.* 242, *Rom.* 344, Proc. B.G. I.1.4–6. On Odoacer, *PLRE* II.791–793. There has been much discussion on the significance of the year 476. Marcellinus *Comes* s.a. 476 described it portentously as ending the empire which began with Augustus, and beginning a new Gothic-dominated rule of Italy: *Hesperium Romanæ gentis imperium, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditæ anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo perit, anno decessorum regni imperatorum quingentesimo vigesimo secundo, Gothorum dehinc regibus Romam tenentibus*. However, for the Italians, the change of ruler was little different to any other usurpation; cf. Croke (1983), Moorhead (1992) 7ff, Barnwell (1992) 134 with reference to the relevant Italian sources.

¹⁰ It is worth pointing out that Odoacer had the support of the Roman senate; cf. Bertolini (1929) 465 and (1941) 25ff and Chastagnol (1966) 24ff. Barnwell (1992) 134 notes that Odoacer still had to gain legitimacy from Zeno but despite his obvious prowess (demonstrated in the defeat of the Rugians) Zeno was not willing to grant recognition to a usurper he had not nominated.

¹¹ For Odoacer's constitutional position, see Bertolini (1941) ch. 2; Jones (1962) 126–127, and Thompson (1982) 65–71.

¹² Bury (1923) I.410–411, Moorhead (1992) 10–11. For the conspiracy between Odoacer and Illus, see John of Ant. fr. 214e.2.

² After 468 the Visigothic King Euric brought most of Gaul and Spain under his control.

³ All these barbarians fled into Roman territory at this time in response to the second Hunnic expansion; cf. Heather (1991) 5–19.

⁴ For a succinct account of events in Italy and the growing importance of barbarian kingdoms on the fringes of the Roman Empire, Moorhead (1992) 6–7 and *CAH* XIV.18ff.

⁵ *PLRE* II.54.

⁶ *PLRE* II.777–778, Iulius no.3.

⁷ On Orestes, *PLRE* II.811–812, no.2, with the relevant sources.

⁸ It is possible that the army demanded lands and permanent settlements in Italy; for discussion, see Moorhead (1992) 7, 33.

assistance. In the early years, despite the threat posed by Attila the Hun, the east managed to send substantial forces on four separate occasions.¹³ The expedition, however, sent to help western forces wrest Carthage from the Vandals (441), was recalled in response to a renewed threat from the Huns who had taken the opportunity to plunder Illyricum.¹⁴ Attila's unexpected death in 453 and the subsequent disintegration of his kingdom was obviously of crucial importance to the stability of the east, in terms of foreign policy. However, internal insecurity was still rife. Succession and domestic policy were directed by the powerful Germanic Aspar whom Leo finally had murdered and replaced with the Isaurian chieftain Tarasicodissa, better known, later, as the emperor Zeno. The knock-on effects in the troubled Balkans were significant. During the fifth century, various groups of Goths had congregated in Pannonia (officially not Roman territory) and within the empire in Thrace. In the 460s, the latter had become federate troops and had established ties with Aspar, whose assassination triggered a revolt among them, calmed only by the offer of an annual tribute of two thousand pounds of gold, an imperial generalship for Theoderic Strabo and an agreement to negotiate with Strabo alone. Meanwhile, the Pannonian Goths marched into Roman territory as far as Macedonia and demanded their own territorial rights.¹⁵

The problematic settlement in the Balkans which Leo bequeathed to his successors was to have far-reaching and serious consequences. It forms the backdrop to Zeno's decision to send Theoderic, leader of the Pannonian Goths, to rule Italy, Anastasius' careful negotiation of Theoderic's status in Italy, and Justinian's decision to reclaim Italy from Ostrogothic rule. However, in terms of immediate impact, Leo's other foray into foreign policy had a far more disastrous impact. After the Vandals had seized Carthage, they had used it as a base from which to conduct raids in both the eastern and western Mediterranean, even threatening the key city of Alexandria. Their persecution of the orthodox Arians, the sack of Rome in 455 and the abduction of the empress Eudoxia and her daughters encouraged Leo to make an attempt

to return the African capital to Roman hands. With Anthemius (Marcian's son-in-law) installed as the western emperor, a two-pronged attack was mounted. The eastern fleet with western forces was to approach Carthage by sea, while the eastern army approached by land from Egypt.¹⁶ A victory would have gone a long way to restoring the prestige of 'Old Rome' and reducing the groups of barbarians encircling the western empire.¹⁷ Unfortunately, from their point of view, the Romans were decisively defeated, with a huge loss of manpower and more than sixty-four thousand pounds of gold.

The reign of Zeno was marred by internal coups and the factional fighting of the Isaurians. Thus, concerned with his own struggle for survival in an empire increasingly troubled with doctrinal problems and economic hardship, Zeno was in no position to interfere directly in western affairs. Moreover, on his doorstep in the Balkans were the Pannonian and Thracian Goths. Both were hostile to each other, and the latter were hostile to the emperor and aided his usurpation by Basiliscus in 475.¹⁸ On Zeno's return from exile, the privileges accorded to the Thracian Goths were transferred to the Pannonian Goths, now led by another Theoderic, the son of Theodemir. He had succeeded his father as king in 471, having spent much of his early life in Constantinople as a hostage for his father's good behaviour.¹⁹ In 475, he led his people from Pannonia to Lower Moesia. After accepting annual payments and an imperial generalship from Zeno, he realised that the latter was trying to turn the two Gothic groups against each other and, with Theoderic Strabo, sent an embassy to Zeno demanding land and grain. The emperor offered him various incentives to make war on Theoderic Strabo,²⁰ but when these failed he himself, rather ironically, made a short-lived alliance with Strabo until the latter supported Marcian's coup in 479. These shifting relationships and alliances were simplified in 481 when Strabo was killed in a riding accident. Theoderic, son of Theodemir, continued to raid Roman territory until 483 when Zeno offered him gifts, lands in Dalmatia and Moesia, the position of *magister militum* and the consulship for 484.²¹ Nevertheless, stormy

¹³ In 410, four thousand troops were despatched to Ravenna to help Honorius against Alaric and the Goths; in 424 an eastern army defeated the usurper John and installed Honorius' nephew, Valentinian III, on the throne; in 431 forces under the command of Aspar were sent to halt the Vandal advance towards Carthage, and in 441 a force was sent to help out after the capture of Carthage.

¹⁴ After threatening Constantinople itself, Attila demanded an annual payment of two thousand, one hundred pounds of gold as well as the territory equivalent to five days' journey south of the Danube, although these concessions were later annulled by Marcian.

¹⁵ Heather (1991) chapter 7.

¹⁶ Proc. B.G. III.6.10–26.

¹⁷ Anthemius was later killed by Gundobad after a quarrel between the western puppet emperor and Ricimer.

¹⁸ Malch. fr. 15.20–22, V. Dan. Styl. 77, with Heather (1991) 273–275.

¹⁹ On the early life of Theoderic, see Hodgkin (1891) ch. 3, Brion (1935) chs. 2–4, Ensslin (1947) ch. 1, Claude (1980) 143ff, and Moorhead (1992) 12–17.

²⁰ Malch. fr. 15–17.

²¹ Theoderic killed Strabo's son and successor, Rekitach, and began to plan the amalgamation of the two Gothic tribes; John of Ant. fr. 214.3, Marc. C. 483, Jord. Get. 289. Despite the appearance of peace, Zeno still did not trust Theoderic and refused

relations continued and Theoderic still devastated Thrace in 486²² and was only dissuaded from marching against Constantinople in 487 by a large financial incentive.²³

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Zeno should have sought a way to eliminate permanently the danger posed by Theoderic in the environs of the imperial capital.²⁴ As the situation in the west was far from satisfactory, a solution which would address both problems would certainly take the pressure off the beleaguered Zeno; and he therefore reached an agreement with Theoderic whereby, according to the Anonymus Valesianus, "Theoderic agreed with him [sc. Zeno] that should Odoacer be defeated, as a reward for his toil [he would take] his [sc. the emperor's place] and [would] rule on [his] behalf until [the emperor] arrived [in Italy]".²⁵ It is with this agreement that the long and much discussed debate about Theoderic's constitutional position in Italy begins. It is questioned at various stages throughout Theoderic's 'conquest' and 'settlement' of Italy; here in 488, and subsequently circa 491, 493 and 498. Prostko-Prostyński believes that Zeno conferred authority to rule Italy (as an administrator) by a formal decree.²⁶ There

his offer of help against Illus; John of Ant. fr.214.3–6, Evag. III.27, Theoph. AM 5977.

²² John of Ant. fr.214e.7; Zach. of Myt. VI.6.

²³ John of Ant. fr.214e.8, Mal. 383, Marc. C. 487, Proc. B.G. I.1.9, Theoph. AM 5977, Mich. Syr. IX.6. A brief sample of the vast amount of secondary literature covering this includes Bury (1923) I.411–422, Ensslin (1947) ch. 2, Stein (1949) II.10–15, Wolfram (1988) 278ff, Heather (1991) 240–308 and Moorhead (1992) 15–17. There is some dispute as to whether Theoderic retained the titles bestowed on him. Mommsen (1910) 444 argued that Theoderic retained the titles of ordinary consul, patrician and *magister militum*, but these were normally temporary offices, and it is unlikely Theoderic would have continued to hold them throughout the hostilities of the mid 480s; cf. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 35–39. On the significance of names, see further, Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 63–74.

²⁴ For discussion of the argument that the despatch of Theoderic to Italy was the suggestion of Zeno (rather than of Theoderic himself), see Moorhead (1992) 17–18.

²⁵ *cui [sc. Zenoni] Theodericus pactuatus est, ut, si victus fuisset Odoacar, pro merito laborum suorum loco eius, dum adveniret, tantum praeregnaret.* Anon. Val. 49 (tr. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 105). For a close analysis of the text of the Anon. Val. and the other relevant sources (Jordanes' *Getica* and *Romana*, Procopius B.G. I.1.10, Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Rom.* XIV.16–17), see Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 103ff.

²⁶ Prostko-Prostyński (1994) p.111 lists the treaty terms as follows: (a) Theoderic was to preserve the laws and political system of the Western empire; (b) He was not to pass any written or unwritten laws; (c) He was to maintain the previous position of the Catholic Church, and especially to keep the regulations in apostasy valid (although Gothic converts were not to be persecuted), to preserve the immunity of the Catholic shrines and the Church's right of granting asylum; (d) He was to keep all the dignities of the public administration for the Romans only; (e) He was to publish in Rome the names of the consuls who had been appointed in Constantinople, and to maintain the traditional collegiate structure of the praetorian prefecture; (f) He was to obtain the codicils of his chief officials (most probably the *illustres*) from the emperor; (g) the rods of the consuls of

are, however, some serious objections to this reconstruction of events. In 488, with severe internal problems and a history of at best uncertain relations with Theoderic, it seems rather more likely that Zeno was desperately seeking for a solution which would rid the east of the Ostrogothic menace, and probably had high hopes of Odoacer and Theoderic destroying each other. It is therefore more probable that the agreement would have been left deliberately vague, at least until Theoderic had fulfilled his objectives.

Towards the end of 488, Theoderic set out for Italy at the head of about one hundred thousand followers.²⁷ Their route took them through lands held by the Gepids who, according to Jordanes, were hostile to the Ostrogoths and were opposed to their migration to Italy. Eventually, Theoderic won a convincing victory and was able to proceed, after another success over the Sarmatians, further towards his goal.²⁸ By August 489, Theoderic was ready to commence his offensive against Odoacer whose lines of defence were insufficient to hold back the Ostrogoths.²⁹ After drawing up his forces at the River Isonzo to the east of Aquileia, Odoacer retreated to Verona where he was defeated and fled to Ravenna. The remaining part of his army under the *magister militum*, Tufa, surrendered at Milan. Theoderic besieged Faenza but at the arrival of Odoacer Tufa changed his allegiance again and handed over some of Theoderic's men to Odoacer. Theoderic and his followers retreated to Pavia where he remained until 490 when, with the help of the Visigoths, Theoderic defeated Odoacer at the River Adige to the east of Milan.³⁰ Odoacer again retreated to Ravenna where he was besieged by Theoderic until February 493 when the bishop, John, negotiated the Ostrogoth's peaceful entry into the city. Theoderic offered the surprising suggestion that he and Odoacer should share the rule of Italy between them, although it is difficult to see how he might have explained this decision to Anastasius, the new emperor in the East.³¹

the West (considering item (f), most probably also the codicils) were to come from Zeno.

²⁷ A detailed account of Theoderic's journey can be found in Stein (1949) II.54–58, Heather (1991) ch. 9 and Moorhead (1992) 19–21.

²⁸ For the details, Moorhead (1992) 20–21.

²⁹ For further details about Theoderic's offensive, see e.g. Bury (1923) I.422–428, Bertolini (1941) 37f, Ensslin (1947) 62–78, Capizzi (1969) 159 and Moorhead (1992) 21–23. On Odoacer's flight see Ennod. *Pan.* VIII.36.30ff, lines 8ff and the Anon. Val. 50.

³⁰ Many of the sources present Odoacer as an unpopular figure and suggest that the Ostrogoth was generally supported by the Italian people who massacred Odoacer's garrisons in their towns. This may be a distortion of events as portrayed by later sources naturally favourable to Theoderic; cf. Moorhead (1992) 28–31. It is certain, however, that the situation in northern Italy was confused further by the arrival of Gundobad and his army who devastated the countryside.

³¹ Cf. Gaudenzi (1888) 21–22 on the sources for this 'agreement' of Theoderic with Odoacer.

The original arrangement between Zeno and Theoderic had made no provision for any joint rule. A concentration of the forces of two powerful Germanic leaders would hardly have diminished Zeno's feelings of insecurity. The next month, however, on the 15th March, 493, Theoderic murdered Odoacer at a banquet.³² Odoacer's son was exiled to Gaul but was subsequently executed on his return to Italy, his wife was starved to death, his brother murdered and the order was given (though surely not carried out to the letter) that all his soldiers should be killed.

Theoderic now took up the reins of government, yet the ambiguous nature of his status is still being debated. The key to understanding Anastasius' role in defining Theoderic's position in Italy must be sought primarily in the accounts of the embassies sent by the Ostrogoth to the emperor, but valuable details about Theoderic's own ambitions, the reactions of the people of Italy and the outlook of Anastasius can all be found in the general contemporary historical and epigraphical sources.

Theoderic's Constitutional Position

In 490, after the initial defeats of Odoacer, Theoderic sent an embassy to Constantinople, led by ■ certain Flavius Rufus Postumius Festus, the *caput senati*. It is recorded that Theoderic sent the envoy to Zeno "hoping to be invested by him with the royal robe".³³ The exact date of the embassy is not known so it is unclear what stage the negotiations had reached by the time of Zeno's death in April 491. However, it is unlikely that any additional concessions were granted as it might have been thought that Theoderic was showing presumptuous haste in asking for recognition in Italy while Odoacer, albeit besieged in Ravenna, was still undefeated.³⁴ Festus consequently returned to Rome empty-

handed, but shortly afterwards a second embassy was despatched by Theoderic.³⁵ This embassy was led by another eminent senator, Flavius Anicius Probus Faustus Niger.

The dating and exact course of the negotiations of this second legation are not clear, but its main aim must have been to obtain Anastasius' recognition of Theoderic's rule in Italy. Theoderic would have known that the new emperor could not have forcefully ejected him from Italy, and so this must have been a courtesy mission: for diplomatic reasons, he was anxious to re-negotiate his position in Italy. The agreement between Zeno and Theoderic had been of a private nature, and the stipulation of Theoderic's rule, "until Zeno should come", was now null and void. However, if the embassy was despatched on the news of Anastasius' accession in the early summer of 491, it must have spent at least a year in Constantinople since the ambassadors, Faustus and Irenaeus, brought back the complaint from the eastern capital that Pope Gelasius had failed to write to the emperor and the patriarch informing them of his accession which had taken place in March, 492. Given that in the subsequent negotiations in 497, the establishment of communion between the churches of the east and the west was seen as a complement to healing political differences, it is possible that on this occasion Anastasius delayed, hoping to convince Theoderic to put pressure on Gelasius to heal the Acacian schism.³⁶ However, it is equally possible that the embassy did not leave Italy immediately; after all, Odoacer had still not been defeated. Indeed, it is probably for this reason that Anastasius was unwilling to grant any further concessions to Theoderic. In addition, there were more pressing concerns closer to home. In the early 490s the Isaurian crisis posed a far greater risk. It appears that the ambassadors returned to Italy only

³² On the charge that Odoacer had been conspiring against him, Proc. B.G. V.1.25, Anon. Val. 54–56, Jord. *Get.* 293–294.

³³ *ab eodem sperans vestem se induere regiam*. Anon. Val. 53 (tr. Rolfe). A record of the embassy can be found in the Anon. Val. 53, with Mathisen (1986) 44. On Festus, *PLRE* II.467–469, no.5.

³⁴ Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 135f believes, however, that the legation completed negotiations with Zeno before his death. He refers (pp.132ff) to the passage from Jordanes *Getica* 295: "It was in the third year after his entrance into Italy, as we have said, that Theoderic, by advice of the Emperor Zeno, laid aside the garb of a private citizen and the dress of his race and assumed a costume with a royal mantle, as he had now become the ruler over both Goths and Romans" (... *tertioque, ut diximus, anno ingressus sui in Italia Zenonemque imp. consultu privatum abitum suaeque gentis vestitum seponens insigne regio amictu, quasi iam Gothorum Romanorumque regnator, adsumit*) (tr. Mierow). He argues from this extract that Zeno agreed that Theoderic should change from his private Gothic dress to *vestis regia* — something which "resembled imperial attire" — and begin

to rule as a Roman monarch. However, this passage is rather flimsy evidence on which to base such a supposition when it is extremely unlikely that Zeno would have made any concessions while Theoderic's task was still incomplete. Given the previous relations between Zeno and Theoderic, it is also improbable that Zeno would be in a hurry to alter the 488 agreement and grant 'royal' powers to the Ostrogoth. There is no further evidence from the sources of a response to Theoderic's request. Barnwell (1992) 136 notes that Jordanes thought that Theoderic was to wear the cloak with royal insignia since he had become the ruler of both Goths and Romans, but as Moorhead (1992) 37–38 points out, Jordanes was continually trying to legitimise Theoderic's status and therefore his account is not necessarily reliable.

³⁵ *PLRE* II.454–456, no.9; cf. Stein (1949) II.113, and Bertolini (1941) 39–40 who stresses the role of the senate in these negotiations. Barnwell (1992) 135 notes that all three embassies show that Theoderic was still expecting to receive instructions from the eastern emperor and seeking confirmation and legitimisation of his power in Italy. On the dating, Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 138–143.

³⁶ See further below, ch. 5, pp.130f.

with the offer that Theoderic could nominate one of the two consuls.³⁷

There were no further extensions of privileges until a third embassy, led by the Festus who had headed the 491 legation, was despatched from Italy in 496. By this time there had been some significant changes. Odoacer had been murdered and Theoderic's Gothic troops, "without waiting for the command of the new emperor, made Theoderic their king".³⁸ It is difficult to understand the significance of these remarks. Theoderic had been '*rex Gothorum*' since 474, so it is unlikely this was the title the troops were conferring. Were the Goths then suggesting the title 'king of Italy'? As it was rare for barbarian kings to adopt territorial titles, it has been suggested that Theoderic was confirmed as king not only of his Ostrogoths, but of the Heruls, Rugi and other tribes of Odoacer.³⁹ It seems more probable, however, that Theoderic (whether he wished it or not) was being confirmed as king both of the barbarian troops in Italy and of the Romans.⁴⁰ The Anonymus Valesianus recorded that "he so governed two races at the same time, Romans and Goths" while Jordanes stated that "he continued his rule over his own race ... and reign over the Roman people".⁴¹

It is certainly clear that while Theoderic may have been content to

³⁷ For a discussion of the terms of this concession, see Bury (1923) I.453 with n.2, Stein (1949) II.111ff, Capizzi (1969) 163 and Moorhead (1992) 37, with n.10.

³⁸ *Gothi sibi confirmaverunt Theodericum regem, non expectantes iussionem novi principis*. Anon. Val. 57 (tr. Rolfe). See Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 131ff for discussion and a review of previous scholarship on this passage.

³⁹ Thompson (1982) 72, but see also Hodgkin (1891) 131, who claims that Theoderic's full title was probably "king of the Goths and Romans in Italy", for which (concerning the Romans), he would need Anastasius' consent; Claude (1980) 155–157, who believes that Theoderic defined his rule territorially, and had "*Italiae dominatum*"; and Brion (1935) 227–233, who believes that Theoderic, having led many different Germanic tribes to reconquer Italy, now had to ask for the title of king after peace had been established.

⁴⁰ It is notable that Theoderic is usually styled simply '*rex*', rather than '*rex Gothorum*' or '*rex Romanorum*' perhaps to avoid the difficulties caused by a more specific title. *Rex Romanorum* would cause diplomatic tension with the east and with the Romans in Italy, while *rex Gothorum* would not acknowledge his undoubted rule over the Romans; cf. Moorhead (1992) 40 and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 56ff, 180. John of Nikiu (LXXXVIII.50f) drew a distinction between Odoacer who bore the title *rex* and Theoderic who resided in Italy for forty-seven years "as its emperor" and refused to appoint a colleague. Stein (1949) II.112 and Capizzi (1969) 161–162 agree that Theoderic coveted the title 'king' (of Italy), implying that he ruled over both the Goths and Romans, rather than that of 'emperor', despite taking the imperial name Flavius. Vasiliev (1950) 320, n.4 (quoting Gaudenzi (1888) 23) wrote: "to take the title *rex*, meant that from then on, Theoderic intended to rule Italy in his own name, and not to be a subject of the emperor of the orient any longer". See also Hartmann (1897) 86ff, Lot (1966) 240 and Barnwell (1992) 136.

⁴¹ *sic gubernavit duas gentes in uno, Romanorum et Gothorum* Anon. Val. 60 (tr. Rolfe); *regnum gentis sui et Romani populi principatum ... continuit*. Jord. Rom. 349.

operate through diplomatic channels to secure recognition of his power, his troops obviously felt no obligation to wait for such niceties after securing their triumph over Odoacer. Views less sympathetic to Theoderic may also be argued. It has been suggested that far from being a spontaneous acclamation by his troops, Theoderic had merely grown tired of waiting for confirmation of his position from Anastasius, and hoped that his soldiers might force the emperor's hand.⁴² In January 497, overtures towards peace were made on both sides: "Theoderic, through Festus, made peace with the emperor Anastasius with regard to his assumption of the rule, and Anastasius sent back to him all the ornaments of the Palace, which Odoacer had transferred to Constantinople".⁴³ However, the fundamental question of Theoderic's constitutional position and his authority, both in theory and in practice, is not answered in this account by the Anonymus Valesianus. It is to other contemporary sources detailing Ostrogothic rule in Italy and the perspective of the eastern emperor that it is necessary to turn in order to gauge the ambitions of Theoderic and the outlook of Anastasius.⁴⁴

Hints on how Theoderic's position was perceived can be gleaned from Procopius' *Wars*. He makes several statements indicating that while Theoderic did not outwardly assume imperial rule, he behaved as an emperor, thus: "And though [Theoderic] did not claim the right to assume either the garb or the name of emperor of the Romans, but was called '*rex*' to the end of his life ... still, in governing his own subjects, he invested himself with all the qualities which appropriately belong to one who is by birth an emperor" and "although in name Theoderic was a usurper, yet in fact he was as truly an emperor as any who have distinguished themselves in this office from the beginning".⁴⁵ When the

⁴² Jones (1962) 128.

⁴³ *facta pace cum Anastasio imperatore per Festum de praesumptione regni, et omnia ornamenta palatii, quae Odoacer Constantinopolim transmiserat, remittit*. Anon. Val. 64 (tr. Rolfe). Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 136–137 translates *praesumptio* as lawless (an explicit criticism that Theoderic exceeded his given authority in the years 493–497) but *praesumo* may be rendered "to anticipate" which allows for a less condemnatory interpretation of Theoderic's action; the Anonymus Valesianus may have intended a simple statement that Theoderic anticipated his formal power. On the *ornamenta palatii*, see Gaudenzi (1888) 32, Wolfram (1988) 284 and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 157–168.

⁴⁴ There is no source which describes exactly the power conferred on Theoderic and it is of course possible that Anastasius left the arrangement deliberately vague to disguise the underlying dilemma: "to abandon the Roman claim to Italy was unthinkable. But to reconquer it was impossible"; Thompson (1982) 75. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 181ff and 207–209 believes that the 497 treaty granted Theoderic a considerable extension to his powers as agreed in 488 but since the treaty is not extant, this argument can remain only a supposition. That Theoderic behaved in an imperial manner is not proof that Anastasius granted him specific powers to do so.

⁴⁵ καὶ βασιλέως μὲν τοῦ Ῥωμαίων οὐτε τοῦ σχήματος οὐτε τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐπιβατεύσαι

Gothic envoys attempted to demonstrate that Justinian's campaign to reclaim Italy for the east Roman empire was unjust given that Theoderic had been invited to take control of Italy by Zeno, Belisarius was uncompromising in his reply: "For Theoderic was sent by the Emperor Zeno in order to make war on Odoacer, not in order to hold the dominion of Italy for himself. For why should the emperor have been concerned to exchange one tyrant for another? But he sent him in order that Italy might be free and obedient to the emperor. And though Theoderic disposed of the tyrant in a satisfactory manner, in everything else he showed an extraordinary lack of proper feeling; for he never thought of restoring the land to its rightful owner".⁴⁶ But this is a judgement which belongs to the context of war when the Roman general could hardly admit to any legitimacy to the Ostrogoth's rule: the original agreement of 488 had stipulated not that Theoderic should return Italy to Zeno, but that he should rule it until Zeno was able to come.

The key question then must be, what privileges did Theoderic exercise when he was ruling Italy? The same Gothic envoys made a series of claims to Belisarius designed to show the restraints of Theoderic's power.⁴⁷ They argued that under Ostrogothic rule the Romans had been left in peace, civil service posts had been kept exclusively for Romans, Catholics had been tolerated, no laws had been promulgated, and western consuls had been confirmed by the east. And indeed, it seems that the envoys were not exaggerating, indicating that the authority which Theoderic chose to exercise was limited in several key ways. He did not (apart from on one occasion) strike gold or silver coins bearing his own effigy, and he passed only edicts, not laws; legislation and the minting of coins being the specific prerogatives of an emperor.⁴⁸ It must be significant, too, that he sought Anastasius' acknowledgement of his rule through senatorial embassies. The senate's support would make for a far smoother transfer of power and

also send a powerful message to Anastasius that the new ruler enjoyed the support of some of the most traditionally minded Romans. It is well known that Theoderic deliberately cultivated senatorial support by promising that the Romans should maintain their monopoly on high-ranking civil service posts.⁴⁹ Thus he reassured his new 'subjects', "promising that with God's help he would keep inviolate whatever the former Roman emperors had decreed".⁵⁰ At the same time, he did, of course, engage in other duties associated with the role of an emperor: for example, in 500, staging an imperial-style visit to Rome to celebrate his tricennalia during which he presided over the chariot races and worshipped the relics of St. Peter.⁵¹ He embarked on a large-scale building programme which included restoration work to palaces, baths, aqueducts, to the amphitheatre at Pavia, and to defensive structures and churches. Perhaps, most importantly, was the construction of a new palace at Ravenna which may have been modelled on the imperial palace of Constantinople, and also the building of the Arian church of S. Apollinare Nuovo. Significantly, the palace was decorated with a mosaic showing Theoderic as the armed autonomous ruler being greeted by representations of Rome and Ravenna.⁵²

For this munificence and generally good governance, he was praised

⁴⁹ For more on the differences in treatment of the Goths and Romans, see Bury (1923) 1.455–456. Theoderic could not confer Roman citizenship on a Goth. It is extremely unlikely that he would have wanted to alter the cumbersome, but efficient, Roman bureaucratic machine, though Amory (1997) 8 argues that in the 510s Theoderic began to recruit support from the "parvenu aristocracy" rather than the old families of Rome, a move which may have alienated the senate.

⁵⁰ *se omnia, deo iuvante, quod retro principes Romani ordinaverunt inviolabiliter servaturum promittit*. Anon. Val. 66 (tr. Rolfe). Theoderic's well-known respect for Roman institutions probably sprang from his early upbringing in Constantinople. It is possible that Goths could enter the senate, as they could reach the rank of *illustris*, the entry requirement for the senate. For most of Theoderic's followers, there were no special privileges. They were settled on the lands occupied by Odoacer's soldiers and those who did not do military service paid taxes to the state treasury; see further, Moorhead (1992) ch. 3; Amory (1997) 8, 117–118.

⁵¹ Theoderic had been acclaimed at the Roman synod, March 1st, 499, an honour usually associated with imperial dignity; Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 206–207. His visit to Rome in 500 has often been depicted as a propaganda stunt as a demonstration of unity: unity within the Roman Church and within Roman politics, and between Rome and Ravenna; cf. Bertolini (1941) 69f. The *tricennalia* was a celebration of thirty years in power, though in Theoderic's case the occasion (and therefore the exact dating) of his assumption of power is unclear. For suggestions and further discussion, see Moorhead (1992) 60–61, with n. 112–113.

⁵² Further details, Moorhead (1992) 41–43, 60–63, Amory (1997) 8. See the account of Ferrandus (*Vit. Fulgentii* 13.27), a Catholic refugee from Africa, for Theoderic's reverence to the relics of St. Peter, and Cass. *Chron.* 500 and Ennod. *Pan.* XI.56 on Theoderic's achievements in building works. His choice of Ravenna as his capital shows he was deliberately associating himself with imperial tradition; cf. Barnwell (1992) 139. On the mosaic, Ward-Perkins (1984) 160ff and Barnwell (1992) 137.

ἤξιωσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥῆξ διεβίου καλούμενος ... τῶν μέντοι κατηκόντων τῶν αὐτοῦ προύστη ξυμπάντα περιβαλλόμενος ὅσα τῷ φύσει βασιλεῖ ἥρμοσται. Proc. B.G. V.1.26. ἦν τε ὁ Θεουδέριχος λόγῳ μὲν τύραννος, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀληθής τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ τιμῇ τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡδοκιμηκότων οὐδενὸς ἦσαν. B.G. V.1.29 (tr. Dewing).

⁴⁶ Θεουδέριχον γὰρ βασιλεὺς Ζήνων Ὀδοάκρῳ πολεμήσοντα ἐπεμψεν, οὐκ ἐφ' ᾧ Ἰταλίας αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχοι· τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ τύραννον τυράννου διαλλάσσειν βασιλεῖ ἔμελεν; ἀλλ' ἐφ' ᾧ ἐλευθέρα τε καὶ βασιλεῖ κατήκοος ἔσται. ὁ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν τύραννον εὖ διαθέμενος ἀγνωμοσύνη ἐς τὰλλα οὐκ ἐν μετρίοις ἐχρήσατο· ἀποδιδόναι γὰρ τῷ κυρίῳ τὴν γῆν οὐδαμῇ ἔγνω. Proc. B.G. VI.6.23 (tr. Dewing).

⁴⁷ Proc. B.G. VI.6.14–22, with Gaudenzi (1888) 28–29.

⁴⁸ Note too that one of Theoderic's privileges was the nomination, but not the appointment of the western consul; cf. Jones (1962) 126, Moorhead (1992) 42, n.37, contra Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 197–202; Barnwell (1992) 136 on coinage, 138 on laws.

in inscriptions; though the epigraphic evidence reveals a rather confused Italy, indicating that contemporaries of Theoderic were either not sure of his exact constitutional role or were deliberately hedging their bets and honouring both him and Anastasius. As a general rule, it seems that titles such as *'perpetuus'* and *'augustus'* were reserved for Anastasius, but Theoderic could be 'glorious' and 'triumph-winning' as in this inscription set up by Valerius Florianus which begins:

salvis dominis nostris Anastasio perpetuo augusto et gloriosissimo ac triumphali viro Theoderico ...

Our Lords Anastasius augustus for ever, and the most glorious and triumph-winning man Theoderic ...⁵³

Other inscriptions were far more imperial in style, such as this one, set up on the Via Appia by Caecina Mavortius Basilius Decius:

D(ominus) n(oster) gl(ori)o(s)issi(mus) adq(ue)
inclyt(us)
rex Theodericus,
vict(or) ac triumf(ator), semper Aug(ustus),
bono r(ei) p(ublicae) natus,
custos libertatis
et propagator Rom(ani) nom(inis),
domitor g(en)tium

Our Lord the most glorious and renowned king Theoderic, victor and conqueror, ever augustus, born for the good of the state, guardian of liberty and defender of the Roman name, tamer of foreign peoples⁵⁴

Instigated by one of the Decii family, this inscription is a good guide to the favourable sentiments of some senators towards Theoderic.⁵⁵

It is clear then that the roles of emperor and barbarian king were not unequivocally demarcated. Theoderic did not exercise certain imperial prerogatives, such as minting coins and passing laws, and certainly did

⁵³ *CIL* vol.VI, no.1794, *ILS* 825 (tr. Moorhead (1992) 47); Gaudenzi (1888) 23ff, Bartoli (1949–1950) 79, Jones (1962) 128. Significantly, the emperor is acclaimed before Theoderic. A second inscription, dated to 492 when Anastasius held the consulship with Rufus, mentions the emperor alone, again as *augustus*: ... *Anastasio PP [au]g Cons[ul]*; *CIL* vol.IX, no. 3568.

⁵⁴ *CIL* vol.X.1, no.6850 and *ILS* 827; translated by Moorhead (1992) 47–48; Gaudenzi (1888) 55–56 and Jones (1962) 128. It has been suggested that this inscription, dated 507–511, calling Theoderic *augustus*, was in response to Anastasius' bestowal of the honorary consulship on the Frankish king Clovis; cf. Courcelle (1948–1949) 51f, contra Barnwell (1992) 137 who points out that the same inscription refers to Theoderic as "king" (*rex Theodericus*). Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 58, with n.130 notes that *dominus noster* was usually reserved for emperors (apart from Christ) but believes that here it does not carry any legal significance, and is merely used out of courtesy to Theoderic.

⁵⁵ *PLRE* II.349, Decius 2.

not set up his own Ostrogothic state in Italy; but in other ways he did behave in an imperial manner, and could and did act independently (and even against the interests) of the eastern emperor. The issue was further complicated by the relationship between east and west. The correspondence of Theoderic as recorded in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus may be useful in defining the relationship of Old and New Rome, as long as the chronology of the letters is kept in mind. The first letter stresses the unity of east and west: "Our royalty is an imitation of yours";⁵⁶ but this was a letter designed to heal tensions after the Sirmium war, after the struggle to secure alliances in Gaul and after the raiding of the Byzantine ships on Italian shores, and therefore should be treated as a piece of diplomacy. Indeed, in the same letter, Cassiodorus expresses the idea that the Roman state was composed of two parts: "We think that you will not suffer that any discord should remain between two republics, which are declared ever to have formed one body under their ancient princes".⁵⁷ This idea was picked up by Anastasius in 516 when he wrote to the senate asking for help in the doctrinal crisis, and repeated by the senate in its reply.⁵⁸

Throughout the 490s and the first decade of the sixth century, Anastasius was in a very difficult position regarding the west. Since his predecessor had invited Theoderic to overthrow Odoacer and rule in his stead, Anastasius was in no position to object to the Ostrogoth's rule in Italy. At the same time, the Isaurian insurrection, the Persian war and the inherited economic insecurity meant there was no possibility of fulfilling Zeno's promise to go and take over rule of Italy. The most Anastasius could hope for was to retain some semblance of imperial control.⁵⁹ Consequently, because Odoacer was still undefeated, he was able to refuse recognition of Theoderic's status to the embassy led by Faustus in 492. That Anastasius did not seek to restore the *ornamenta palatii* to the west after March 493 when Odoacer had finally been murdered, may be explained by the hasty acclamation of Theoderic's troops confirming their leader as 'rex'.

⁵⁶ *regnum nostrum imitatio vestra est*. Cass. *Var.* I.1.3 (tr. Moorhead (1992) 44).

⁵⁷ *quia pati vos non credimus inter utrasque res publicas, quarum semper unum corpus sub antiquis principibus fuisse declaratur, aliquid discordiae permanere*. Cass. *Var.* I.1.4–5 (tr. Moorhead (1992) 44).

⁵⁸ Gunther (1895–1898), nos.113.4, 114.7. See further, Moorhead (1992) 44ff and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 81ff and 174.

⁵⁹ The argument that Anastasius was more relaxed than Justinian concerning protocol because he did not issue stipulations (for example, that acclamations of the emperor should always come first and that a statue of the emperor should be set up to the right of any statue of the king) is not secure; Justinian may have merely been reinforcing previous practice, or it is possible that Theodahad (Theoderic's successor) had been known to contravene these customs; Proc. *B.G.* V.6.4–5, with Jones (1962) 128.

By 497, however, the situation had changed. With the Isaurian crisis drawing to a close, Anastasius had much more time to consider affairs in the western half of his empire. It is now likely that pragmatism (he must have been aware of Theoderic's obvious strength of position in Italy) and the promise of the healing of the Acacian schism offered by the two papal legates accompanying Festus combined to convince the emperor to recognise Theoderic's rule.⁶⁰ There had been no more favourable opportunity for healing the rift with Rome than the present moment, under the conciliatory guidance of the pope, Anastasius II. Moreover, while Anastasius had seen proof of Theoderic's controlled and unpretentious rule, his power was growing, not only in Italy, but generally throughout the west. As the Ostrogoth formed alliances with the Franks, Burgundians and Visigoths, Anastasius possibly felt it was too dangerous to leave his position in Italy undefined and unacknowledged.⁶¹ It thus seems that of the three possibilities of status — imperial, royal and magistral — Theoderic's most resembled the royal level.⁶² For a start, the very fact of the return of the *ornamenta palatii* to him by Anastasius suggests that Theoderic was more than just a *magister militum* in the service of the emperor. Yet the limitations on his power, demonstrated in the textual and epigraphic evidence and by his own actions, precluded the grant of imperial power.⁶³

In answer to the criticism that, with the *ornamenta palatii*, Anastasius surrendered the very heart of the Roman Empire to a barbarian chief, it must be said that, in real terms, the western half of the empire had been lost from imperial control for several decades. Anastasius had enough to deal with in the east, making it impossible to carry out Zeno's agreement and go to Ravenna himself. Giving up the *ornamenta palatii*, particularly when the façade of imperial rule still remained to some extent, was not a very great price to pay for the promise of real unity in the empire based on the union of the Church, for which Anastasius had been striving with his namesake in Rome, Pope Anastasius II. Of course, with the premature death of the pope, this unity was not

to be achieved and while Theoderic himself did not appear to seek an imperial title, it is clear that he desired a certain amount of independence under the general umbrella of eastern sovereignty.⁶⁴ In both his religious and foreign policy it is evident that he would not be beholden to Anastasius.

The Doctrinal Schism of 491–506

Evidence of this independent attitude in religious affairs can be found soon after Theoderic's arrival in Italy, and in the continuing schism between the churches of the east and west Theoderic was not sympathetic, at least initially, to Anastasius' cause. Indeed, over the years of Theoderic's rule in Italy, an unmistakable pattern emerges: during periods when relations with Constantinople were strained, Theoderic tended to be supportive of those popes who held a hard-line attitude towards the Acacian schism, while at times when political interaction was rather more harmonious, Theoderic was willing to support the pro-eastern ecclesiastical faction. There is some evidence to show that Gelasius quickly agreed on a *modus vivendi* with Theoderic, securing the Arian's agreement that the Catholic clergy should not be subject to secular control. It is thought that Theoderic's mother, Erelieva, and possibly other members of his family were Catholics.⁶⁵ It is possible, too, that the church politics of Gelasius and the secular politics of Theoderic were in fact complementary, and while Gelasius strove to maintain the primacy of the apostolic see over Constantinople, so Theoderic tried to isolate Italy from the administrative clutches of the eastern imperial capital. Politics and theology met in the Balkans and it is conceivable that Gelasius' assiduous correspondence with the bishops of Dardania and Illyricum contained more than doctrinal purpose. For if the churches could be wooed from Constantinople, then

⁶⁴ Theoderic had once referred to the life of Aspar in order to show that "the elevation of an Arian and Germanic chief to the imperial dignity was impractical", *Acta synodorum habitatum Romae* (*Anagnosticum regis*, 14), quoted by Wolfram (1988) 285.

⁶⁵ Amory (1997) 197ff argues that Gelasius was concerned only with the role of the emperor in doctrinal affairs and that Theoderic provided far less cause for concern. In the first half of the 490s, the latter's position had not yet been ratified, and his heretical Arian beliefs were of less importance than the growing monophysitism of the emperor. Gelasius composed two treatises against Arianism (now no longer extant) and he complained of the 'barbarian incursions' of 493 in a letter to the bishop of Picenum but most of his correspondence concerned the imperial interference in papal matters and in a letter to the Dardanian bishops he wrote of the many heresies among the Greeks (Thiel (1868) 335f, Gunther (1895–1898), no. 79). Gelasius reportedly referred to Theoderic as "my Son" (*filius meus*); contra Ullman (1981) 220–1 who sees a "cultural divide between pope and king". See also ch. 5, pp. 128–131.

⁶⁰ Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 151–153 believes that there are no grounds for believing that the concessions in religious affairs contributed to the successful outcome of the political negotiations. However, without the promise of communion between the churches of the east and west, there would have been little incentive for Anastasius to make changes to the status quo.

⁶¹ See Bertolini (1941) 47f, and Gaudenzi (1888) 27 on Theoderic's increased power through international relations.

⁶² Contra Lot (1939) 138ff who believes Theoderic's power was magistral.

⁶³ It is notable that Theoderic's successors (Athalaric, Amalasuntha, and Theodahad) sought legitimacy from Justin and Justinian. Eutharic was appointed a consul and adopted as Justin's son-at-arms; cf. Barnwell (1992) 136–137. Clearly there remained strong links between *utraque res publicae*.

how much greater would be the influence commanded by Rome (and thus Ravenna) on the affairs of the Balkans.⁶⁶ It is uncertain whether Theoderic was keen to allow the religious differences to fester and worsen, while political relations followed down the same slippery slope, or whether he would have been pleased at the election of the pro-eastern, conciliatory Anastasius II in 496.⁶⁷

The agreement negotiated between Anastasius and Festus in 497 never had a chance to mature. After the premature death of Anastasius II, Rome and Constantinople were plunged into chaos with the election of two papal candidates, Laurentius and Symmachus.⁶⁸ Theoderic's decision in favour of the latter has often been presented as a snub to Anastasius, for the Ostrogoth might have been expected to support Festus' candidate, the pro-Byzantine, pro-*Henoticon* Laurentius, in gratitude for the return of the *ornamenta palatii*. However, although Laurentius did not lack senatorial approval, Symmachus had been ordained first and had secured greater support, and therefore won Theoderic's backing as well.⁶⁹ After the turn of the century, however, Theoderic began to have second thoughts about his support of Symmachus, and to realise the implications for his relationship with Anastasius. In 500/501, Festus was able to bring charges against Symmachus and presented a draft of a *libellus* against the beleaguered pope to the king. If Anastasius' *libellus* against Symmachus is to be dated to 499 (not 507),⁷⁰ then it is likely that Theoderic realised the determination of the emperor to have a pope sympathetic to the cause of unity in the Church. He therefore appointed a Visitor, Peter of Altinum, to carry out papal duties while Symmachus was under investigation, and arranged for a synod to be held on 1st September,

502 to discuss the charges against Symmachus. After numerous false starts, a synod was eventually held on 23rd October, although its outcome (in favour of Symmachus) was hardly decisive. This ambivalence allowed the supporters of Laurentius to persuade Theoderic to agree to the anti-pope's return to Rome.⁷¹

The schism continued for several years until late 506/early 507 when Theoderic finally decided in favour of Symmachus and ordered that Laurentius should leave Rome. It is clear that some incident must have prompted Theoderic's change of heart from neutrality to his outright patronage of Symmachus and his faction; and it is evident that the deteriorating political relations between Ravenna and Constantinople, with regards to the Balkan war and the race to establish diplomatic relations in Gaul, were to blame.⁷²

*War in the Balkans*⁷³

In 504, Theoderic decided to send a force to recover Sirmium from the Gepids which had been wrested from them when they had tried to block Theoderic's path to Italy, but which they had subsequently recovered.⁷⁴ The motives for this offensive are fairly clear. There had

⁷¹ For further details, Moorhead (1992) 114–124.

⁷² His increasing enthusiasm for Symmachus' cause can be seen in his choice of consuls. As late as 504, he selected a certain Flavius Cethegus (*PLRE* II.281–282), a supporter of Laurentius, yet by 506 two candidates in favour of Symmachus were chosen for the top jobs: Flavius Messala (*PLRE* II.759–760, no.2), Faustus' son, for the consulship, and Constantius (*PLRE* II.321, no.15), a friend of Faustus, as prefect of Rome. Faustus himself probably became praetorian prefect in 507. During these years, there is evidence of division among the senate. A significant number of senators, led by Faustus, did not adhere to the sentimentality of a united empire, and were prepared to back a candidate openly criticised by the eastern emperor. On the other hand, some senators realised that Symmachus, like Gelasius, was no friend of the aristocracy; he would not return land donated to the church in more prosperous years; Bertolini (1929) 468ff and Burns (1984) 88f.

⁷³ See map p.110 showing the area in the Balkans disputed by Anastasius and Theoderic at this time and later (508–512).

⁷⁴ The past history of this region of the Balkans is important in judging the justification of Theoderic's claim. In 440, the Huns, with the Ostrogoths and Gepids, arrived in the Balkans, led by Attila. After his death, however, these barbarians began to go their separate ways. For example, in 454, the Gepids revolted and occupied Dacia. The Goths settled in Pannonia, but after 473 some of them moved further into the interior of the Balkans to Sirmium and the environs. The sequence of events seems to indicate that Pannonia Secunda, except Sirmium, was handed over to the Ostrogoths by the east Romans, and the Gepids subsequently took Sirmium. See variously, Gaudenzi (1888) 42ff, Hodgkin (1891) 211ff, Ensslin (1947) 133ff, Stein (1949) II.145ff, Wozniak (1981) 351ff, Croke (1982a) 127, Wolfram (1988) 321ff, Heather (1991) ch. 7, Moorhead (1992) 174ff and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 215ff.

⁶⁶ Cf. Lamma (1940) 172 and ch. 5, pp.163–164.

⁶⁷ It has been suggested that Theoderic went so far as to use his secular authority to influence the election of the latter; Cessi (1919) 50–53, contra Lamma (Picotti) (1956) 253 who believes that Theoderic's tolerance favoured Gelasius and later Symmachus and Hormisdas.

⁶⁸ The Laurentian schism will be discussed fully in ch. 5, pp.133–136. It is useful here, however, just to highlight the actions of Theoderic; cf. Cessi (1919) 107ff and Alessandrini (1944), Moorhead (1992) ch. 4, Amory (1997) 204ff.

⁶⁹ Cf. Cessi (1919) 143, who believes that there were good relations at this time between the Laurentian faction and the Ostrogoths at the Ravenna court; contra Amory (1997) 200ff who sees Theoderic as maintaining a neutral position. He argues (p.204) that it is not possible to see any specific links between the parties of the papal candidates and pro- or anti-Gothic interests. For the role of Theoderic in supporting Symmachus, see Alessandrini (1944) 169ff and Bertolini (1941) 74ff. For a discussion on whether Theoderic's decision was influenced by the support mustered for Symmachus in Rome or by bribery, see Moorhead (1992) 159, with n.109.

⁷⁰ For the argument in favour of dating Anastasius' *libellus* against Symmachus to 499 rather than 507, see ch. 5, p.135. Cf. Cessi (1919) 123ff.

been long-running hostility between the Ostrogoths and Gepids which had culminated in the Gepids' attempt to halt the Goths' march to Italy in 488. The annexation of Pannonia Secunda with the key city of Sirmium for the west was an aggressive act of expansion. Strategically, as Ennodius recorded, control over the Sava valley gave Theoderic an immense advantage against the Gepids and other potential invaders.⁷⁵ As immediate triggers, Ennodius noted minor skirmishing and trespassing across the border and the attempt of Traseric, the ruler of Sirmium, to conclude an anti-Italian alliance with a Gepid chief.⁷⁶

As regards Theoderic's relations with Constantinople, this assertive foreign policy did not help to ease tension in the early 500s. Theoderic may always have been suspicious of the Gepids and their friendship with the Romans.⁷⁷ After all, when his predecessor, Odoacer, had tried to extend his borders in the Balkans, a force of Gepids came against him, at the instigation of Zeno. It cannot have been a coincidence that Theoderic waited until Anastasius was deeply involved with the Persian war before striking.⁷⁸ The careful timing paid off, and it seems that the Gepids, hampered by internal differences, yielded with little opposition. Theoderic's army, commanded by Pitzias, attacked Traseric and seized Sirmium. Traseric managed to escape, although his mother was captured.⁷⁹ Theoderic ousted the Gepids from the right bank of the Danube and annexed Pannonia Secunda, with its capital Sirmium, to the Italian kingdom.⁸⁰

⁷⁵ Ennod. *Pan.* XII.60.23–26.

⁷⁶ Ennod. *Pan.* XII.60.27 and XII.61.28–29.

⁷⁷ Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 221 notes the claim in Ennodius' panegyric XII.69.32–34 (p.211) that the conquest of Sirmium had been to the advantage of both east and west, but this is more likely to be a statement of propaganda; contra Barnwell (1992) 137–138 who sees the capture of Sirmium not as an anti-Gepid move but predominantly as a measure to regain for the west a province which had previously belonged to the west but currently was in the possession of the east.

⁷⁸ It is also significant that Theoderic did not personally take up arms, which enabled him to avoid the charge that he had fought against the Roman Empire; cf. Brion (1935) 292, contra Cassiodorus' propaganda, "By the power of the lord king Theoderic the Bulgars were defeated and Italy regained Sirmium" (*virtute D.N. regis Theoderici victis Bulgaribus Sirmium recipit Italia*) Cass. *Chron.* 504 (tr. Moorhead (1992) 175).

⁷⁹ See Ennod. *Pan.* XII.60.26ff, Marc. C. 505, and Jord. *Get.* 300–301; for division in the Gepids, see Hodgkin (1885) 438.

⁸⁰ Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 223ff points out the discrepancy in the accounts of Cassiodorus and Ennodius. The latter (*Pan.* XII.63–69) records that Sirmium was taken without bloodshed and then describes the defeat of Sabinianus' Bulgarians the following year. Cassiodorus, however, re-dated the defeat of the Bulgarians to 504 and associated it with the fall of Gepid Sirmium. He recorded nothing for 505, and therefore avoided noting anything about the embarrassing defeat of the east Roman forces. Ennodius was writing in 507 when relations between Constantinople and Ravenna were very cool; Cassiodorus was writing in 519 when there was a move towards reconciliation. Prostko-Prostyński (p.225) therefore believes that Cassiodorus' account should be ignored as not historically accurate.

But Anastasius was suspicious of Theoderic's movements. It was greatly preferable that the important frontier town of Sirmium should be occupied by the Gepids, rather than by the Goths who were more of a threat to the empire's stability. However, the situation was further complicated by the actions of the freebooter, Mundo, who was running wild in the province of Moesia I at the head of a band of brigands. The chronology of events in Mundo's life is difficult to establish. We do know that at some point he went to the court at Sirmium but was later forced to leave by his cousin, Traseric, the new king. He crossed to the right bank of the Danube and joined up with another Gepid tribe. At some stage, too, he became an ally of Theoderic, a point which reveals further strained diplomatic relations between Anastasius and the Ostrogoth.⁸¹ It was only with the conclusion of the Persian war that Anastasius could contemplate action, either with the unwelcome occupation of the Goths or the equally unwelcome depredations of Mundo. As an initial foray, he directed his attentions against Mundo, sending the *magister militum per Illyricum*, Sabinianus, with a force of ten thousand Bulgarians, to capture the freebooter.⁸² Mundo, though, appealed for help to Theoderic's general, Pitzias, who was settling the territory he had won from the Gepids. He adopted Mundo's cause, marched into Dacia and with only two thousand infantry and five hundred cavalry, won a decisive victory over the imperial forces at Horreum Margi, by the River Morava. Many of the imperial forces drowned in the river while a small force with Sabinianus were able to escape and seek shelter in a fort called Nato, as yet unidentified.⁸³ Theoderic recalled Pitzias to Pannonia, but he did not offer to return Sirmium and subsequently minted coins there.

Diplomacy and the West

Successful in the Balkans, Theoderic began to look to the west for further outlets for his influence and authority. The four major powers in the west at this time were the Visigoths, Burgundians, Franks and

⁸¹ For general information on Mundo, Croke (1982a) and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 226ff. On his alliance with Theoderic, Stein (1949) II.145.

⁸² Sabinianus was the son of the general of the same name who had fought Theoderic in Macedonia twenty-six years previously.

⁸³ Marc. C. 505; Jord. *Get.* 301. It is interesting that in Marcellinus *Comes'* account, there is no mention of Pitzias. He sees a polarisation of this part of the conflict into a contest between Sabinianus, representative of Anastasius, and Mundo, federate of Theoderic; Moorhead (1992) 175 and Croke (1995) 112. On the location of this battle see Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 231ff who argues that Marcellinus *Comes'* account placing the battle at Horreum Margi should be rejected in favour of Jordanes who puts the battle at Margum.

Vandals, and he sought to bond all four to him through various marriage alliances.⁸⁴ One of his daughters married the Visigothic king, Alaric II, and another married Sigismund, the future king of the Burgundians. In 500, his sister Almafreda married Thrasamund, king of the Vandals, while he himself married Clovis' sister.⁸⁵ Such a policy, as well as cementing peace throughout the west, was designed to secure his own position in Italy and strengthen his guard against any attempt of Anastasius to reclaim the western half of the empire.⁸⁶

Theoderic's scheming, however, was not altogether successful. In 506, his relations with the Frankish king hit a rocky patch.⁸⁷ The Alamans, defeated by Clovis in the battle of Tolbiac, sought the protection of Theoderic in Raetia, and he now refused to hand them back to their conquerors, thus causing a diplomatic rift between the Ostrogoths and the Franks.⁸⁸ Moreover, despite a determined effort, Theoderic failed to prevent open warfare between the Visigoths and the Franks, although it is possible that the quarrel between Clovis and Alaric was engineered by Anastasius. The cause of the disagreement was always unknown. Theoderic claimed that there was no serious point of dispute, but as the two kings were resolved on war, he hinted at the interference of a third more powerful body, an "alien malignity".⁸⁹

In the event, Alaric was slain at the battle of Vouillé by, it was rumoured, Clovis himself, and Aquitaine (the Visigothic kingdom) was annexed to the kingdom of the Franks.⁹⁰ As Clovis, recently baptised,⁹¹ was depicted almost as a Christian crusader driving heretical Arianism out of Gaul, he earned the respect of the Gallic-Roman Church and, in turn, that of the emperor.⁹² Naturally, there is speculation as to whether Clovis' conversion was driven by sincere religious zeal or just pure

ambition. In addition, considering his subsequent success over the Visigoths and his reward of the 'consulship' from Anastasius in 508, it is not impossible that the Frankish king was encouraged by Byzantine diplomacy.⁹³

The conferral of the consulship on Clovis was recorded thus by Gregory of Tours:

igitur Chlodovechus ab Anastasio imperatore codicillos de consulatu accepit, et in basilica beati Martini tunica blatea indutus est et chlamyde, imponens vertici diadema. tunc ascenso equite aurum argentumque in itinere illo, quod inter portam atrii basilicae beati Martini et ecclesiam civitatis est, praesentibus populis manu propria spargens, voluntate benignissima erogavit, et ab ea die tanquam consul et Augustus est vocitatus.

Clovis received letters from the emperor Anastasius conferring the consulate, and in the church of the blessed Martin he was vested in the purple tunic, and in a mantle, and set the diadem upon his head. Then, mounting his horse, he showered with his own hand in the generosity of his heart pieces of gold and silver among the people all along the road between the gate of the atrium of the holy Martin's church, and the church of the city. From that day he was hailed as consul or Augustus.⁹⁴

Now, although Gregory wrote that Clovis received the consular codicils, it is unlikely that the Frankish king became an ordinary consul as his name does not appear on the consular *fasti*.⁹⁵ It is therefore much more probable that Clovis was awarded a rank equivalent to that of proconsul or honorary consul.⁹⁶ As to the fact that Clovis is described receiving imperial insignia, the diadem and the title '*augustus*', several explanations have been proposed.⁹⁷ Gregory and Clovis have both been

⁸⁴ Cf. Levillain (1933), van de Vyver (1937) 370ff, Lot (1939) 119ff and Moorhead (1992) 175ff.

⁸⁵ Theoderic's niece married the king of the Thuringians, Hermanfried, and Clovis married Gundobad's niece.

⁸⁶ Cf. Bury (1923) I.462.

⁸⁷ On the Franks generally, see Musset (1975) ch. 3, Wallace-Hadrill (1985) ch. 4, James (1988), *PLRE* II.288–90, and on the chronology of Clovis' reign, Bachrach (1970).

⁸⁸ Gaudenzi (1888) 46, Stein (1949) II.147f with n.1 and Moorhead (1992) 176.

⁸⁹ *aliena malignitas*, Cass. *Var.* III.4.4. In this letter, Theoderic tried, without success, to persuade Clovis not to go to war against the Visigoths; Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 257–258. See also Cass. *Var.* III.1, 2 and 3, with Levillain (1933) 542–543, Moorhead (1992) 177–178.

⁹⁰ See Moorhead (1992) 178 for details of the battle, and Levillain (1933) 545ff for more details on the division of Alaric's kingdom by the Franks and Burgundians.

⁹¹ The date of Clovis' conversion is disputed: there are good arguments for Christmas Day 496, 498 and 506, cf. Musset (1975) 229–230 and Moorhead (1992) 178–179, with n.23.

⁹² On Clovis as a crusader, see Wood (1985) 297. On the history of the Arian Visigoths in Tours and the gratitude of the citizens at Clovis' arrival, see Courcelle (1948–1949) 52ff.

⁹³ Cf. Capizzi (1969) 168. A letter written by Clovis' grandson, Theodebert, to Justinian recalls the amicable relations which had existed under earlier rulers (*Epistolae Austrasiacae* no.20, pp.132–133 ed. W. Gundlach, in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*); cf. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 258–259. There was a history of good relations between the eastern Roman emperors and the Franks; Clovis' father, Childeric, demanded of the emperor Marcian "Order me to go to Gaul as your servant" and Marcian agreed; Wallace-Hadrill (1962) 85 and Moorhead (1992) 184 with n.50.

⁹⁴ Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Fr.* II.38 (tr. Dalton (1927) II.78).

⁹⁵ The nature of Clovis' consulship has been discussed at length; e.g. Courcelle (1948–1949), Chrysos (1981), McCormick (1986) 335–337 and Moorhead (1992) 184–186; see Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 248–253 for an overview of scholarship to date.

⁹⁶ Cf. Bury (1923) I.464, with n.1. In the prologue of the *Lex Salica* Clovis is referred to as a proconsul.

⁹⁷ The key phrase *ab ea die tanquam consul aut augustus est vocitatus*, variously translated and subjected to several emendations, can provide little help; for a summary of the manuscript emendments, Moorhead (1992) 185, n.53. He argues that it seems safest to allow this version to stand.

blamed for what is usually considered a misrepresentation of the honour. Gregory, it is thought, writing seventy years after the event, may simply have been unfamiliar with the protocol, but it does seem unlikely that the bishop would be ignorant of the implications of the designation 'augustus'.⁹⁸ The belief that the ambitious Clovis himself turned an ordinary consular ceremony into an imperial coronation, and deliberately fabricated the idea that he was an imperial consul also seems somewhat harsh.⁹⁹ On the other hand, it is clear that the act of parading around Tours, dressed in the purple chlamys and diadem and distributing largesse, was undoubtedly the mark of an emperor¹⁰⁰ and there is evidence for Clovis instigating the building of the church of the Holy Apostles or St. Peter in Paris, another imperial activity.¹⁰¹ It is likely, however, that in 508 Clovis merely capitalised on the opportunity to celebrate his triumph in a very Roman manner; he was not seriously setting himself up as emperor in Gaul. From other sources, it appears that there would be nothing unusual in Anastasius' acknowledgement of Clovis, particularly after such a significant gain of new territory. Procopius wrote later that "the Franks never considered that their possession of Gaul was secure except when the emperor had put the seal of his approval upon their title".¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Courcelle (1948–1949) 57 goes too far in imagining that Gregory would not know the difference between 'consul' and 'augustus'. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 253–257, 259ff questions the reliability of Gregory, pointing out that his dogmatic Catholic faith and positive bias towards Clovis makes him an "uncertain and unreliable source". He suggests that the description of the ceremony is more fitting for an imperial consulship (cf. Ensslin (1936) 500–506 on the significance of Clovis' dress) and that Gregory based his account of the ceremony for Clovis on the imperial consulship ceremony held in 566 which he had heard about from the legation of Chilperic II; the bishop did not realise there were differences in the conferring of an honorary and imperial consulship. However, Prostko-Prostyński also notes that Gregory alone is not to blame for the distorted picture and draws attention to a passage in the *Historia Francorum* by Aimoin of Fleury XXIII whose record is similar but not identical to Gregory's, thus indicating the existence of other written sources.

⁹⁹ Cf. Courcelle (1948–1949) 49.

¹⁰⁰ See the detailed discussion of Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 259ff on the significance of Clovis' attire and actions as those of an emperor; contra Barnwell (1992) 95 who believes that the distribution of largesse etc. could be the mark of an imperial officer / a military commander celebrating a triumph in the provinces.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Moorhead (1992) 185.

¹⁰² οὐ γὰρ ποτε ὄντο Γαλλίας ξὺν τῇ ἀσφαλεῖ κεκτηῖσθαι Φράγγοι, μὴ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος τὸ ἔργον ἐπισφραγίσαντος τοῦτο γε. Proc. B.G. VII.33.4 (tr. Dewing), followed by Fustel de Coulanges, *L'invasion germanique et la fin de l'empire*, Paris 1891, who wrote: "Henceforth, Clovis appeared in the eyes of the Gallo-Romans as the emperor's delegate, and consequently as the representative of the ancient order of things, which, in the midst of the troubles of those times, remained the expression of law. His conquests were in some sort legitimized", quoted by Lot (1966) 250. It has also been suggested that the clergy, grateful for their deliverance from the heretical Arians, and nostalgic for the idealism of imperial sovereignty, were not averse to hailing Clovis as

Even if it is not possible to know the exact nature of the position granted by Anastasius, his motive in rewarding Clovis in such a way is clear. For while this was ostensibly a simple recognition of the Frankish king's military triumph in the name of Christianity, the emperor would have been aware of the tension between Theoderic and Clovis. Thus, Anastasius' recognition of Clovis in this way would be certain to annoy Theoderic who had been forced to wait seven years before any recognition of his conquest was granted. Significantly, from Anastasius' point of view, Clovis' new status would provide a timely counterbalance to Theoderic's power in the west.¹⁰³

Just prior to this diplomatic activity (late 507/early 508), Anastasius sent a fleet of one hundred ships and one hundred *dromones* with eight thousand soldiers to ravage the Apulian coast, as a warning to Theoderic to contain his ambitions both in the Balkans and towards the west.¹⁰⁴ However, the sending of such an expedition must have caused Anastasius some sleepless nights. While he needed to sound a warning to Theoderic, it was very difficult to do so without striking against Theoderic's subjects, who were also under his own imperial sovereignty. Marcellinus *Comes* takes a critical line: "When they had crossed the sea they won for Anastasius Caesar a shameful victory, which Romans snatched from Romans with piratical daring".¹⁰⁵ Cassiodorus, who may not have been averse to exaggerating the extent of the damage caused by the Byzantine fleet, claims that the crops in Apulia were burnt (*Variae* I.16) and that the population of the town of Sipontum was attacked (*Variae* II.38). Theoderic reinforced the walls of Rome and of various cities on the coast of Italy. It is probable, however, that the main aim was to blockade Italy, thus endangering trade with the east and making it difficult for Theoderic to go to the aid of the Visigoths. It was not until June, 508 that the Ostrogothic troops were mustered and invaded Gaul in an effort to stop the influence of the Burgundians and Franks reaching the Mediterranean and threatening the remainder of territory still in Visigothic possession.¹⁰⁶

consul and *augustus*; cf. Courcelle (1948–1949) 55–56.

¹⁰³ Cf. Rémondon (1964) 2, Wallace-Hadrill (1985) 72, Barnwell (1992) 95.

¹⁰⁴ Marc. C. 508; Jord. *Rom.* 356.

¹⁰⁵ ... *remensoque mari inonestam victoriam, quam piratico ausu Romani ex Romanis rapuerunt, Anastasio Caesari reportarunt*. Marc. C. 508 (tr. Croke). Marcellinus fails to mention the consulship of Theoderic's nominee for this year, indicating that in this breakdown of diplomatic relations the western consul was not recognised in the east.

¹⁰⁶ For hints that Theoderic was galled into taking revenge against Clovis' army, 508–511, Brion (1935) 302ff; on the movements of the Ostrogothic army in Gaul, Moorhead (1992) 182–183. It seems that at some point Theoderic tried to persuade Gundobad not to join the Franks against the Visigoths by sending him gifts of a sundial and water-clock; Cass. *Var.* I.45f. Sour relations already existed between the Burgundians and Ostrogoths

Despite this continuing activity in Gaul, Theoderic began to make an effort to heal the rift with Constantinople and sent a legation to Anastasius, led by the erudite and eloquent patrician Agapitus, with the famous letter which stands at the head of the *Variae*.¹⁰⁷ This was the letter in which Theoderic stressed the unity of the empire while indicating that the *pars orientis* was the superior: "Our royalty is an imitation of yours",¹⁰⁸ but he was also seeking to patch up recent differences: "It is proper for us, most clement emperor, to seek peace, it being acknowledged that we have no grounds for resentment ... Indeed, tranquillity is something to be desired by every state in which the peoples make progress and care is taken for what is useful for the nations ... And so, most pious of princes, it is in accordance with your power and an honour for us, who have hitherto enjoyed your love, to seek concord with you".¹⁰⁹ The reception and outcome of this letter are not reported but it appears there was at least a temporary healing in relations.¹¹⁰ There were no further hostilities, though the jockeying for allies continued.

from the early 490s when the Burgundians had devastated north Italy while the Ostrogoths were still operating against Odoacer; cf. Moorhead (1992) 181–182. It is to the period immediately before these preparations for war that the panegyric of Ennodius belongs (507), which explains why so much emphasis is placed on Theoderic's abilities as a successful general; see further Amory (1997) 113ff.

¹⁰⁷ On Agapitus, Cass. *Var.* II.6; *PLRE* II.30–32, Agapitus 3, Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 238ff, especially on the dating of the legation.

¹⁰⁸ *regnum nostrum imitatio vestra est*. Cass. *Var.* I.1 (tr. Moorhead (1992) 44) cf. n.55.

¹⁰⁹ *oportet nos, clementissime imperator, pacem quaerere, qui causas iracundiae cognoscimus non habere: ... omni quippe regno desiderabilis debet esse tranquillitas, in qua et populi proficiunt et utilitas gentium custoditur ... et ideo, piissime principum, potentiae vestrae convenit et honori, ut concordiam vestram quaerere debeamus, cuius adhuc amore proficimus*. Cass. *Var.* I.1.1f (tr. Moorhead (1992) 186). So obsequious is the sycophancy that it has been suggested that either Theoderic did not fully understand the meaning, or Cassiodorus altered it when publishing it; see Hodgkin (1891) 221. It is particularly ironic that Cassiodorus credits Theoderic with "tranquillity", after all his activity both in the Balkans and Gaul.

¹¹⁰ It is thought that at this time Theoderic, whilst retaining a proportion of Pannonia Secunda including the capital Sirmium, handed back the eastern part of the province, including the city of Bassinae; cf. Stein (1949) II.156 (followed by Capizzi (1969) 170) who saw the peace as a disgraceful defeat for Anastasius: "une paix qui équivalait à une défaite byzantine à peine voilée". Stein argued further that it was at this time that Anastasius recognised Mundo's possession of the Danube river region in Moesia I to the east of the River Morava. He based his argument on two passages of Procopius (*B.G.* VII.33.8 and VII.34.10) which show the Goths as being in possession of Dacia. However, there is no evidence in any contemporary source for the transfer of any part of this region to Mundo or the Ostrogoths; cf. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 241–245 who argues that under "Agapitus' treaty" (agreed between 1st September, 509 and the beginning of 511) Anastasius had to formally surrender Pannonia Sirmiensis to Theoderic, and during the reign of Amalasuntha, Justinian had to formally surrender Pannonia Bassianensis and many of the forts in Moesia I in return for an annual tribute.

In order to strengthen his influence in the Danube area, Theoderic adopted the king of the Heruls, Rodulf, as his son-at-arms. However, the Lombards, who had recently established themselves between the Danube and the Tisza rivers just to the north of the Gepids, suddenly attacked the Heruls and inflicted a crushing defeat. Rodulf himself was killed. Theoderic, preoccupied with events in Italy and Gaul, was unable to offer military help; he could only take in a few refugees and the remaining Heruls returned to Scandinavia.¹¹¹ In 512, these Heruls were settled by Anastasius inside the Byzantine frontier where they took to pillaging the land until checked by a detachment of imperial troops.¹¹² Despite this inconvenience, are we to see the settlement of the Heruls on Roman territory as a simple gesture of kindness or as a subtle piece of diplomacy on Anastasius' part? By the settlement, Anastasius could be seen to be challenging Theoderic's claim of alliance with the Heruls. Considering the volatile nature of occupation in the Balkans, it was sound policy to cultivate links with barbarian tribes.

Anastasius was also successful elsewhere in maintaining loyalty and alliances. He sustained good diplomatic relations with the king of the Burgundians, Gundobad, despite the latter's adherence to Arianism, and was on even better terms with his son, Sigismund, who had converted to Catholicism under the influence of Avitus, the bishop of Vienne.¹¹³ Sigismund wrote to Anastasius on his accession as his "most faithful and devoted minister" (*fidelissimo e devotissime ministro*), pledged his own loyalty: "My people is your people, and it pleases me more to serve you than to preside over it", and referred to old ties.¹¹⁴ In another similar letter, he thanked the emperor for granting him "*militiae fasces* (the honorary title of *magister militum*), *aulae contubernium* (the title of patrician?) and *venerandam Romani nominis participationem* (alliance with the Empire)".¹¹⁵ Evidence from coinage

¹¹¹ On Theoderic's adoption of the Herul king, Moorhead (1992) 193. Theoderic's inability to come to the aid of his 'son-at-arms' suggests that Anastasius' policy of supporting the Franks and Burgundians was successful in helping to prevent Theoderic building up a huge 'empire' of client-kingdoms, or annexed territory.

¹¹² Stein (1949) II.150f, Capizzi (1969) 171, and Wolfram (1988) 322. Marcellinus Comes (512) suggests Anastasius resettled the Heruls to strengthen depopulated lands around Singidunum; cf. Croke (1995) 117.

¹¹³ There had been good relations between the east Roman empire and the Burgundians since about 443 when they had been granted Sapaudia, an eastern region of Gaul. Similarities in government (e.g. official titles) continued after 476; cf. Barnwell (1992) 82. On Anastasius and relations with the Burgundians, Ensslin (1947) 302f, Stein (1949), II.185–189, Barnwell (1992) 84.

¹¹⁴ *vester quidem est populus meus, sed me plus servire vobis quam illi praeesse delectat*. Avitus, ep.83 (tr. Barnwell (1992) 84).

¹¹⁵ Avitus, ep.84; Lot (1966) 247.



reveals that Constantinople retained a degree of hegemony over the Burgundians. The obverse carried an image of Anastasius while the reverse carried only the monogram, not the portrait, of the Burgundian king.¹¹⁶ It is clear that Theoderic was alarmed at the new level of friendship between Constantinople and the Burgundians (bearing in mind the problems such an alliance with the Franks had caused), and this unease is revealed in a telling incident in 516. When Sigismund came to the throne in that year he sought the patronage of the then powerful Vitalian, and his legation passed without difficulty through Italy. However, an embassy sent just prior to this, carrying the Burgundian king's offer of friendship and submission to the eastern emperor, was detained by Theoderic; clearly a demonstration of the Ostrogoth's disquiet about the continuation of Anastasius' diplomatic overtures towards the west.¹¹⁷

The Doctrinal Schism of 516

While political relations continued uneasily, the religious schism, deepened by the animosity between Anastasius and Symmachus, persisted. The new pope, Hormisdas, was no less intransigent than his predecessors and Anastasius, far from having the opportunity to persuade him to his point of view, had the revolt of Vitalian to contend with. As suggested in chapter five, there were suspicions concerning links between the rebel and Theoderic. Vitalian's nationality is unknown but there remains the possibility that he was a fellow Goth and may have been in league with Theoderic.¹¹⁸ It is tempting to see the appointment of Procopius Anthemius (son of Anthemius, emperor in the west 467–472) as consul in 515 as an attempt to draw the east and west closer together by evoking old ties.¹¹⁹

It is difficult to judge Anastasius' stance on relations with the west. A single letter addressed to the senate in 516, carried by Theopompus and Severianus, appears to hold two opposing views.¹²⁰ The emperor

addresses the senate as "his own senate" (*senatui suo*) and uses ■ greeting that would not have been out of place in a letter of Augustus to his senate; he addresses tribunes and proconsuls, offices long obsolete in Italy. After the introduction, he begins: "If you and your children are in good health, it is well; I and my army are in good health also".¹²¹ Yet while he includes ■ long list of cognomina (Alammanicus, Francicus, Sarmaticus etc.), he omits '*Gothicus*' which perhaps indicates diplomatic acquiescence of Theoderic's position in Italy.¹²² Again he acknowledges Ostrogothic rule: "with the exalted king to whom the power and the responsibility of ruling you is committed".¹²³

It is clear that the circumstances of the letter go some way to explaining this anomaly. Anastasius, hoping that senators might use their influence on the pope to create ■ more pro-eastern Church, sought to highlight the close ties between the senate and Constantinople. On the other hand, by exalting Theoderic's *potestas*, Anastasius diminished the *auctoritas* of the pope. The reply is interesting as, while the senate is clearly rather less pro-Byzantine than in the days before the Laurentian schism, and does not propose to help influence Hormisdas, it nevertheless addresses the emperor with the usual appellations, "unconquered emperor" (*imperator invicte*) and "most pious emperor" (*piissime imperator*). Furthermore, it casts a favourable light on the relationship between the two rulers: "our lord and unconquered king, your son Theoderic, who orders obedience to your commands".¹²⁴

It is in this interchange of letters between Anastasius and the Roman senate that the theme of the Roman Empire composed of two equal parts (*utraeque res publicae*) is revisited: Anastasius would like to see coexistence of orthodoxy and monophysitism, as ■ parallel to the coexistence of the two arms of the Roman secular state.

¹²¹ *Si vos liberique vestri valetis, bene est; ego exercitusque meus valemus* (tr. Hodgkin (1885) 470).

¹²² Cf. Amory (1997) 209.

¹²³ *apud excelsum regem, cui regendi vos potestas vel sollicitudo commissa est* (tr. Hodgkin (1885) 471).

¹²⁴ *domini nostri invictissimi regis Theoderici filii vestri mandatorum vestrorum oboedientiam praecipientis accederet*. Thiel (1868) 767 and Gunther (1895–1898) no.114 (tr. Hodgkin (1885) 472). It has been suggested that Anastasius went so far as to make Theoderic his adoptive son; cf. Gaudenzi (1888) 59. There is no evidence for this, but it is possible that the senators saw Theoderic, figuratively speaking, as the son of Anastasius, the eastern emperor's ruler in the west; cf. Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 113ff who notes that Theoderic had been adopted by Zeno as his 'son-at-arms' in 483, ■ relationship which had expired on the death of the emperor in 491 and had not been renewed by Anastasius.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Barnwell (1992) 84f. He also notes that the *Book of Constitutions* (*Liber Constitutionum*) compiled by Gundobad or Sigismund was very similar to Roman law, thus reflecting Burgundian acceptance of Roman tradition.

¹¹⁷ Avitus, *ep.* 47; Bury (1923) I.463, Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 279–280. For bad relations between the Burgundians and Ostrogoths, see above, n.106.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Ensslin (1947) 297ff, Capizzi (1969) 171, Moorhead (1992) 195 and Prostko-Prostyński (1994) 279–280. Others believe that Vitalian was also in contact with Hormisdas; Hartmann (1897) 210, Sundwall (1919) 222ff and Cessi (1920) 218ff.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Moorhead (1992) 195.

¹²⁰ See Thiel (1868) 765 and Gunther (1895–1898) no.113; translated Coleman-Norton (1966) 962–964, no.548, with Hodgkin (1885) 470–472, Bertolini (1941) 81–82, MacPherson (1989) 70 and Amory (1997) 209–210.

Conclusion

Anastasius' letter and the senate's reply indicate that, nearly twenty years after the return of the *ornamenta palatii*, Theoderic's position was still, to some extent, open to interpretation. While Theoderic was careful in some areas not to assume delusions of imperial grandeur in Italy, his eagerness to secure foreign allies betrayed his lust for expansion and power. Anastasius' policy of countering this threat with his own alliances reveals only too clearly that mutual distrust had not yet worn away.

Circa 502, Priscian wrote in his panegyric to Anastasius:

omnia sed superat, princeps, praeconia vestra
propositum, sapiens quo fidos eligis aulae
custodes, per quos Romana potentia crescat,
et quo, Roma vetus misit quoscumque, benigne
sustentas omni penitus ratione fovendo,
provehis et gradibus praeclaris laetus honorum,
ne damni patriae sensus fiantve dolores.

But, o Princeps, your wise plan of choosing loyal guardians of the royal court, to increase through them the power of Rome, and of generously supporting those sent by old Rome by favouring them in every conceivable way, surpasses all your praiseworthy deeds. You gladly promote them through the ranks of distinguished appointments so that they may not feel pain at the loss of their homeland.¹²⁵

These exiles would have corresponded with their colleagues back in Rome and may have been responsible in part for any pro-Byzantine sentiment still lingering.¹²⁶ While the exact identity of these exiles cannot be known with certainty,¹²⁷ it is sufficient to note here Priscian's propaganda in emphasising the benefits of the eastern empire and the merits of the eastern emperor in comparison with those of the western king. Priscian continues a few lines later: "Both Romes, I hope, may now obey you alone with the help of the almighty Father who sees all things".¹²⁸ These sentiments should be taken rather less literally, for it is unlikely that Priscian sincerely believed that unity between east and

west under the authority of the east Roman emperor could be achieved during the reign of Anastasius.¹²⁹ Doubtless Priscian was voicing an underlying desire, the fulfilment of which he must have known was a long way off. In this one must recognise Anastasius' foresight. Even Justinian, drawing on the resources carefully accumulated by Anastasius, experienced horrendous difficulties in recovering Italy; and his eventual success resulted in a war-torn, dilapidated and impoverished land which, after only three years under Roman government, became an easy prey for the new waves of barbarian hordes, beginning with the Lombards.¹³⁰ Anastasius, lacking the resources available to Justinian, did well to contain Theoderic's expansionist schemes, particularly by his diplomatic alliances in Gaul, and to establish terms, albeit uneasily, on which he and Theoderic could coexist. Had it not been for the continuing Acacian schism, Anastasius and Theoderic might well have enjoyed ■ much better relationship. However, notwithstanding the setbacks in their relations, Anastasius was viewed in hindsight as a rather pro-Gothic emperor. Hence the coins of Totila were minted in the name of "the long since deceased pro-Gothic Anastasius".¹³¹ Moreover, in Totila's letter to Justinian expressing his desire for peace, he wrote: "We demand that you, for your part, take for yourself the advantages which flow from peace and also grant them to us. These advantages are recalled and exemplified most admirably in the lives of Anastasius and Theoderic, who ruled as kings not long ago, and filled their whole reigns with peace and prosperity".¹³²

Anastasius inherited the on-going problem of how the east Roman empire should deal with the *pars occidentis*. Zeno had attempted to solve the problems of the fifth century but his vague arrangement with Theoderic left too much room for manoeuvre. Anastasius had to deal with the delicate problem of the Ostrogoth's status in Italy and had

¹²⁹ Amory (1997) 139 argues that the hope of unity referred not to the secular states (cf. Bury (1923) 1.467; Chadwick (1981) 43), but to the healing of the Acacian schism; dating the panegyric to 512 he sees that this would be particularly relevant at the height of the schism and in the lead-up to the revolt of Vitalian. This theory is rather less attractive if the panegyric belongs to the early years of the 500s, as argued in appendix B.

¹³⁰ Cf. Rubin (1986a) 47; Amory (1997) 206f comments on how the initial success of Justin and Justinian in healing the political and religious schism between east and west quickly faded.

¹³¹ W. Hahn, *Moneta Imperii Byzantini*, Paris 1973, 1.79–85, noted by Wolfram (1988) 532–533.

¹³² αἰτούμεθα τὰ ἐκ τῆς εἰρήνης καλὰ σέ τε προσέσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμῖν ξυγχαρεῖν. ὥνπερ μνημεῖά τε καὶ παραδείγματα κάλλιστα ἔχομεν Ἀναστάσιόν τε καὶ Θεοδορίχον, οἱ βεβασιλεύκασιν μὲν οὐ πολλὰ πρότερον, εἰρήνης δὲ καὶ ἀγαθῶν πραγμάτων ἅπαντα ἐνεπλήσαντο τὸν κατ' αὐτοὺς χρόνον. Proc. B.G. VII.21.22–23 (tr. Dewing).

¹²⁵ Prisc. Pan. 239–245 (tr. Coyne).

¹²⁶ Bury (1923) 1.467.

¹²⁷ Suggestions for the identity of the immigrants include exiles from Vandalic North Africa, supporters of Laurentius and Festus (Gaudenzi (1888) 64), and dissidents banished by Theoderic (Gabatto (1911) 240–241). Momigliano (1960) 240 believes they were aristocratic families, such as the Anicii, who left the unsettled west and sought the political and cultural stability of the east. For a summary of these views, Coyne (1991) 167–169.

¹²⁸ *utraque Roma tibi nam spero pareat uni / auxilio summi, qui conspicit omnia, patris.* Prisc. Pan. 265–266 (tr. Coyne).

little choice but to offer some form of recognition of Theoderic's *de facto* rule. Competition for territory and alliances in the Balkans and Gaul led to divisions in secular politics which were compounded by the unresolved Acacian schism separating the churches of the east and west. Anastasius was in no position to reclaim Old Rome by force and therefore attempted to create conditions for a *modus vivendi* with Theoderic, while not neglecting opportunities for keeping eastern interests alive in the politics of Gaul.

II. Foreign Policy in the Balkans

Marcellinus *Comes* records the four incursions of 'barbarian' tribes into Roman territory in the Balkans during the reign of Anastasius. The identity of these tribes is uncertain, but it is possible that they were tribes of Bulgars.¹³³ The first of Marcellinus' accounts, recorded for 493, tells us simply that "Julian, the Master of the Soldiery, was struck by a Scythian sword while fighting in a night battle in Thrace, and died".¹³⁴ A much longer account is rendered for the second imperial defeat in 499. It begins: "The Master of the Illyrian Soldiery, Aristus, with fifteen thousand armed men and five hundred and twenty wagons, weighed down with the arms necessary for fighting, set out against the Bulgars who were invading Thrace".¹³⁵ Marcellinus goes on to record details of a battle beside the River Tzurta where over four thousand imperial troops perished, either in flight or with the collapse of the river bank. The *comites* Nicostratus, Innocentius, Tancus and Aquilinus all died there.¹³⁶ After this massive defeat for the imperial troops, a similar

raid was undertaken, unopposed, three years later. Again Marcellinus reports the incursion, this time with a hint of frustration and anger at the frequency of the raids: "The familiar race of the Bulgars again devastated the oft-ravaged Thrace as there was no Roman soldiery to resist them".¹³⁷

There is a long gap until the last invasion to take place during Anastasius' reign. In 517, barbarian cavalry devastated Macedonia, Epirus and Thessaly, reaching as far as Thermopylae.¹³⁸ Again Marcellinus provides a record, together with details of an unsuccessful attempt to rescue the Roman captives: "At that time both Macedonias and Thessaly were ravaged and the Gothic cavalry plundered as far as Thermopylae and Epirus Vetus. Through Paul, the emperor Anastasius sent one thousand pounds of gold denarii to John, the prefect of Illyricum, to ransom the Roman prisoners. Because that was not enough the Roman prisoners were either burnt while shut in their dwellings or killed in front of the walls of the enclosed cities".¹³⁹ The extent of the devastation is evoked by Marcellinus' reference to the Book of Jeremiah, "Behold a people cometh from the north country and a great nation shall be stirred up from the innermost parts of the earth".¹⁴⁰

These four raids claimed many Roman lives and caused much destruction and enduring damage, including serious depopulation.¹⁴¹ What of Anastasius' response? From the record of the 517 incursion, it is clear that the attempt to ransom the Roman prisoners was unsuccessful. The *tribunus* Paul, who was responsible for delivering the ransom money to the praetorian prefect of Illyricum, John, was

of the Bulgars' piercing battle songs on the Romans. Notices on the four *comites* killed are given in the *PLRE* II.784 Nicostratus 1, II.591 Innocentius 4, II.1052 Tancus and II.125 Aquilinus 5. On Aristus, II.147, no.2.

¹³³ *Consueti gens Bulgarorum depredatam saepe Thraciam, nullo Romanorum milite resistente, iterum devastata est.* Marc. C. 502 (tr. Croke); cf. Theoph. AM 5994.

¹³⁴ The identity of these barbarians is uncertain. Niederle (1923) 61, Dvornik (1959) 34 and Croke (1995) 120 believed they were Slavs; contra Bury (1923) I.436, n.2 who suggested they were Bulgarians or Slavs, and Stein (1949) II.105 who thought they were Antes. There is not enough evidence to come to a firm decision, although Procopius *B.G.* VII.38.6-8, writing about the year 549, remarks that οἱ Σκλαβηνοὶ had not yet attempted to settle on Roman territory.

¹³⁵ *duae tunc Macedoniae Thessaliaque vastatae et usque Thermopylas veteremque Epirum Getae equites depredati sunt. mille tunc librarum auri denarios per Paulum Anastasius imperator pro redimendis Romanorum captivis Iohanni praefecto Illyrici misit: deficiente pretio vel inclusi suis cum domunculis captivi Romani incensi sunt vel pro muris clausurarum urbis trucidati.* Marc. C. 517 (tr. Croke).

¹⁴⁰ Jeremiah VI.22, quoted by Croke (1980) 190 and (1995) 120.

¹⁴¹ It is possible that a further defeat inflicted by barbarians on Pompeius (the emperor's nephew) at Adrianople also belongs to this period. Jord. *Rom.* 356; Stein (1949) II.106 and *PLRE* II.898-899, Pompeius 2.

¹³³ There are a number of suggestions as to the origins of these barbarians; perhaps the most likely proposal is that they were the Bulgars who first appeared in the Balkans in about 480 and were used by Zeno against the Ostrogoths; cf. Croke (1980) 188 and (1995) 108. See also Lemerle (1954) 282-283 who agrees but believes they were the future Kutrigur and Utzigur Hunnic tribes. Bury (1923) I.434-435 thought they were the remnants of the Hunnic empire of Attila, but Zonaras XIV.3.26 refers to them as "Bulgars hitherto unknown" (τὸ τῶν Βουλγάρων ἔθνος ... μῆπω πρὶν γινώσκόμενον). Marcellinus *Comes*, an Illyrian, alludes to the Romans being attacked *Scythico ferro*. There was little attempt by contemporaries to distinguish between different types of barbarian.

¹³⁴ *Julianus magister militiae nocturno proelio pugnans Scythico ferro in Thracia confossus interiit.* Marc. C. 493 (tr. Croke). See also Zon. XIV.3.26 and *PLRE* II.639, Julianus 15.

¹³⁵ *Aristus Illyricianae ductor militiae cum quindecim milibus armatorum et cum quingentis viginti plaustris armis ad proeliandum necessariis oneratis contra Bulgares Thraciam devastantes profectus est.* Marc. C. 499 (tr. Croke).

¹³⁶ Marc. C. 499, followed by Jord. *Rom.* 356 and Zon. XIV.4.8-10, who adds the effect

probably the same Paul who delivered a donative to the Illyrian army in 500.¹⁴² This largesse, sent to encourage and strengthen resolve after the terrible defeat by the Bulgars the previous year, did not, however, prevent the incursion of 502 to which there was no resistance, as recorded by Marcellinus. However, the long gap between the raids of 502 and 517 indicates that Anastasius' attention to what became known as the Long Wall was the most successful factor in preventing the destructive barbarian incursions.

The Long Wall

One of the most enduring landmarks (both figuratively and literally) of Anastasius' reign was his building or restoration of the construction referred to variously as the Long Wall or the Anastasian Wall. Today, the southern part of the wall has almost disappeared, but the central and northern sections are fairly well preserved. It is clear that the wall stretched for a distance of about twenty-eight miles from the sea of Marmara, just to the west of Selymbria, to the Black Sea, between Podima and Lake Dercos. It lay about forty miles to the west of Constantinople and was designed to ensure that any attacking army would be kept a safe distance from the capital and that important suburbs such as Rhegion and Selymbria would also be protected.¹⁴³ Preserved now in places to a height of five metres, the wall was about eleven feet thick with further defence provided by polygonal towers and forts.¹⁴⁴ The building of the wall entailed a new administrative system. In conjunction with the abolition of the vicariate of Thrace, the wall and the region between it and Constantinople came under the jurisdiction of two vicars: one under the praetorian prefect, and the other accountable to the *magister militum per Thracias*.¹⁴⁵ There have

been two points of contention about the wall, one concerning the dating, and the other concerning the nature of Anastasius' contribution to the project; that is, whether he was responsible for the complete construction of the wall or merely for restoration work.

The confusion over whether Anastasius himself had the Long Wall constructed or just restored stems from varying accounts in the sources. While several sixth-century authors, including Procopius of Caesarea, Procopius of Gaza and Evagrius, all attribute the wall to the work of Anastasius, references can be found in two fifth-century sources which indicate that there was a wall existing before the reign of Anastasius, implying therefore that he was responsible for restoration and repairs only. Mention of this earlier wall can be found in the *Life of Daniel* in a passage describing the escape of Zeno from a plot against his life in 469, and in a fragment of Malchus, detailing a sortie by the bodyguard of Theoderic in 478.¹⁴⁶ It is possible, however, that these references are not to the Thracian Long Wall, but to the Chersonese Long Wall, mentioned by Herodotus.¹⁴⁷ There is no convincing reason to query the sixth-century sources which attribute the wall to Anastasius; for while Procopius of Gaza's reference may be attributed to the demands of the rhetoric of an encomium, there is no particular reason why Evagrius and especially Procopius of Caesarea should have recorded the wall as the work of Anastasius.¹⁴⁸ The fact that it became known as the 'Anastasian Wall' suggests that Anastasius' contribution must have been fairly significant.¹⁴⁹

The problem of fixing a date for the wall arises from inconsistency

¹⁴² *PLRE* II.853, Paulus 29; *PLRE* II.608, John 62.

¹⁴³ Crow and Ricci (1997) 260 argue that the wall was intended as defence for the capital and its environs rather than the water supply to Constantinople (on the aqueducts, see pp.235ff). For previous research on the wall, see C. Schuchhardt, 'Die Anastasius-Mauer bei Constantinopel und die Dobrudscha-Walles', *JDAI* 16 (1901) 107–115 and R.M. Harrison, 'The Long Wall in Thrace', *Archaeologia Aeliana* 4th series 47 (1969) 33–38. For reports on recent fieldwork, Crow (1993), Crow and Ricci (1997), Crow (1999) and (2001).

¹⁴⁴ The question of whether there were also earthworks (a ditch or moat) was debated in earlier scholarship following Evagrius III.38 who referred to a deep ditch filled with water. Bury (1923) 1.435 maintained that the wall had no additional defence; contra *ODB* II.1250–1251 claiming there was an outer moat. Janin (1964) 261ff discusses the contribution of the Arab writers on this problem; but see the most recent research carried out by Crow; e.g. (1993) 109–118, (1997) 34–38 where evidence of a ditch is cited. On the construction of the wall, towers and forts, Crow and Ricci (1997) 245ff.

¹⁴⁵ Bury (1911) 68, Stein (1949) II.89–90 and Croke (1982b) appendix.

¹⁴⁶ *V. Dan. Styl.* 65, Malch. fr.18. The debate about Anastasius' contribution to the Wall has been polarised by the articles of Croke (1982b) and Whitby (1985). The latter envisages a scheme whereby the wall was constructed in 447 by Theodosius II after the humiliating terms dictated by the Huns, was severely damaged by the 478 earthquakes, and was finally restored by Anastasius. Whitby argues that the references to the wall by Procopius of Caesarea, Procopius of Gaza and Evagrius do not categorically attribute the original construction to him.

¹⁴⁷ Herodotus VI.36.

¹⁴⁸ "The Emperor Anastasius had determined to put a stop to this and so built long walls at a distance of not less than forty miles from Byzantium, uniting the two shores of the sea on a line where they are separated by about a two-days' journey." (ὁ δὲ ἀναστέλλειν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς διὰ σπουδῆς ἔχων ἐν χώροις οὐκ ἦσσαν ἢ σημείοις τεσσαράκοντα τοῦ Βυζαντίου διέχουσι μακρὰ οἰκοδομησάμενος τείχη, ἀμφὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τὰς ἀκτὰς ἔξευξεν, οὐ δὲ ἀλλήλαιν διεστήκασιν ὁδῶ ἡμέραιν δυοῖν μάλιστα.) *Proc. de Aed.* IV.9.6 (tr. Dewing); *Evag.* III.38, *Proc. Pan.* 21.

¹⁴⁹ For example, *Chron. Pasch.* 517: "In this year was built the Long Wall which was called Anastasian" (τοῦτω τῷ ἔτει ἐκτίσθη τὸ μακρὸν τείχος τὸ λεγόμενον Ἀναστασιακόν) (tr. Whitby and Whitby); cf. Allen (1981) 157–158. It is beyond doubt that Anastasius undertook to improve the defence of the peninsula against the barbarian raids of the 490s and early 500s and to protect the approach to Constantinople. See also Crow and Ricci (1997) 239 with n.28 and Mango (1990) 42.

in the sources. No clue is provided either by Procopius of Caesarea or by Evagrius who places his notice on the wall between entries on Dara (506/7) and the abolition of the *chrysargyron* (498). The building of the wall is recorded in the *Chronicon Paschale* under the year 517. The other entry for this year, ■ demonstration in the circus in favour of crowning Areobindus emperor, is covered much more fully by Marcellinus *Comes*, and placed under indiction five, the consulate of Paulus and Musicianus in 512. The year 497, also a fifth indiction, has been proposed as well.¹⁵⁰ However, the suggestions of 497 and 512 make little sense when imperial strategy and the general context of the 490s and 500s are taken into account. After the failure of the army to prevent the raids of 493, 499 and 502, which were, after all, merely another example of the general insecurity and upheaval suffered by the whole Balkan region throughout the fifth century and earlier, Anastasius realised that a greater and more permanent defence was now required to provide secure protection for the capital. It is likely, therefore, that after the devastation in Thrace in 502 caused by the “familiar race of Bulgars”, Anastasius began work on the Long Wall.¹⁵¹ It is surely significant that after this spate of incursions, it was not until 517 that imperial territory was again subjected to widespread destruction which was directed not towards Constantinople, but towards Greece.

The success of the Long Wall was disputed, with its critics claiming that it failed because it was too long to defend, and faced too many threats from invading armies.¹⁵² However, these criticisms are based on a passage of Procopius: “But in fact [the Wall] was the cause of greater calamities. For neither was it possible to make safe a structure of such great length nor could it be guarded rigorously. And whenever the enemy descended on any portion of these long walls, they both overpowered all the guards with no difficulty, and falling unexpectedly upon the other people they inflicted loss not easy to describe”.¹⁵³ As

with Dara and other eastern defences, it is necessary to bear in mind Procopius’ bias in the *de Aedificiis*; he wished to present Justinian restoring the ineffectual defences of his predecessor. It seems, on the contrary, that the Long Wall was fairly successful in discouraging barbarians, especially from making any attempt against Constantinople.¹⁵⁴ From the patterns of barbarian incursions against the empire of Justinian, it appears that when the wall was in good repair and manned it did afford effective protection to Constantinople. For example, in 559, the Huns penetrated the unguarded, earthquake-damaged wall, but after repair by Justinian and the citizens of Constantinople, it blocked the path of the Avars in 577 and the Slavic invasions of 581.¹⁵⁵

*The Defensive Building Programme in the Balkans*¹⁵⁶

As he had in the east, Anastasius sought to repair and restore fortifications along the western lines of defence. While a reading of the *de Aedificiis* indicates that most improvements were carried out during the reign of Justinian, there is firm archaeological evidence to demonstrate Anastasius’ involvement. Epigraphic and numismatic material, missing from the eastern sites, can be used to build a fuller picture of Anastasius’ concerns with western defensive fortifications.¹⁵⁷

At Histria on the Black Sea coast a large number of bricks bearing the official stamp

+IMP(erator) ANASTASIOS

have been discovered. The bricks were found by the curtain wall, on the north-west side of the wall surrounding the citadel, suggesting that it had been rebuilt during Anastasius’ reign.¹⁵⁸ Excavation of the south-west and eastern parts of the citadel has yielded both private and

¹⁵⁰ E.g. Bury (1923) 1.435 with n.5, Chauvot (1986) 220–221, n.113.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Croke (1982b) *passim*.

¹⁵² Bréhier (1914) col.1452; contra Whitby (1985) 579, Anastasius established an “effective defence”. Crow and Ricci (1997) 239 note that the Wall often successfully withstood attack during the sixth century, but was most frequently remembered when it failed to stop an assault.

¹⁵³ ἦν δὲ ἅρα μειζόνων τοῦτο συμφορῶν αἰτιον. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν οἰκοδομῆσαι τοσαύτην τὸ μέγεθος ἢ ἐς τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἐξεργάσθαι, ἢ φρουρεῖσθαι ξὺν τῷ ἀκριβεῖ. ἐπειδὴν τε μοῖρα τινὶ τούτων δὴ τῶν μακρῶν τειχῶν ἐπισκῆψαιεν οἱ πολέμιοι, καὶ τοὺς φρουροὺς ἅπαντας ὑποχειρίους ἐποιούντο οὐδενὶ πόνῳ, τοῖς τε ἄλλοις ἐπιπίπτοντες ἀπροσδόκητοι κακὰ οὐκ εὐδιήγητα ἐξεργάζοντο. Proc. *de Aed.* IV.9.7 (tr. Dewing). See Crow (1993) 118ff and Crow and Ricci (1997) 239 on this passage. They point out that the surviving towers have not yet shown any structural evidence for Justinian’s renovations, as described by Procopius.


¹⁵⁴ Crow (1993) and Crow and Ricci (1997) 259–60 on how the Long Wall fits into the history of the development of the defensive structures of the empire. After the ‘crisis’ of the third century, the empire relied on defensive barriers to a far greater extent, and it was particularly telling that the ‘last frontier’ of the empire in the Balkans was only two days’ march from the imperial capital.

¹⁵⁵ Further examples are given by Croke (1982b) 69–71 and Crow and Ricci (1997) 239–240. For the details of the 559 incursion, see Agathias *Hist.* 5.13.5–6. By the beginning of the seventh century, however, barbarian fighting methods had become far more sophisticated and the steppe nomads who had previously confined themselves to lightning raids, now came prepared with siege engines; Crow (1993) 122 and Crow and Ricci (1997) 240.

¹⁵⁶ See map p.110 for the following sites where defences were improved by Anastasius.

¹⁵⁷ For an overview of defences in Scythia, Scorpan (1980).

¹⁵⁸ Barnea (1960) 365–366, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 263.



public buildings, including two basilicas,¹⁵⁹ and some large edifices overlooking Lake Sinoe.¹⁶⁰ All these have been dated between the end of the fifth century and 580, and have been more specifically attributed to the reign of Anastasius.¹⁶¹ The ruins of many fifth- to sixth-century constructions and a huge collection of coins dating from Anastasius to Justin II were found in the sector situated on the western plateau of the citadel, indicating that this sector was more extensively occupied under Anastasius.¹⁶²

The restoration of Tomis, the capital of Scythia on the Black Sea coast, was attributed by Procopius to Justinian.¹⁶³ However, it is by no means certain that the three Greek inscriptions describing the renovation of the curtain wall are Justinianic.¹⁶⁴ Indeed, Parvan has asserted that they were from either the reign of Justinian "or a somewhat earlier epoch".¹⁶⁵ It has been pointed out that some of the lettering closely resembles that on other brick stamps carrying the name of Anastasius, and that of the inscription

D(ominus) N(oster) ANASTASIUS P(ius) AUG(ustus)

on a silver plate belonging to Paternus, the bishop of Tomis. It is thought that the Tomis rampart (the Axiopolis), fifty-nine kilometres long, might also date from the reign of Anastasius.¹⁶⁶ Corinthian and Ionic impost capitals dated to the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth demonstrate that there was a significant amount of building activity during this period, and the possibility that it was Anastasius who was responsible for at least some of the improvements at Tomis (contra Procopius) cannot be excluded.

Similar evidence is found at Callatis, also on the Black Sea coast. There are many sculptures and capitals from the second half of the fifth century and beginning of the sixth, attesting activity under Anastasius.¹⁶⁷ Capitals at Stratonis and Tropaeum Traiani (in the interior of Scythia) date to the same period. At the latter, buildings were erected and rebuilt under both Anastasius and Justinian.¹⁶⁸ Constructions, such

¹⁵⁹ For descriptions of these basilicas, Barnea (1958) 331–335.

¹⁶⁰ Barnea (1958) 336 discusses a private basilica (a rectangular hall with an apse at the east end) in this eastern part of the town, which dates from the end of the fifth century or beginning of the sixth; see further, Scorpan (1980) 78ff.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Parvan (1915–1916) 701–702 and (1925) 248.

¹⁶² Cf. Petre (1963) 319.

¹⁶³ *Proc. de Aed.* IV.11.20.

¹⁶⁴ A similar inscription was found at one of the towers.

¹⁶⁵ Parvan, quoted by Barnea (1960) 370.

¹⁶⁶ This construction may be compared to the Thracian Long Wall; Vulpe (1938) 259–260, 371, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 264.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Barnea (1958) 344 and (1960) 371.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Barnea (1960) 371.

as the gate towers, dating to the end of the fifth century or beginning of the sixth, indicate work carried out by Anastasius at Mesambria (Black Sea coast), a site which is omitted from Procopius' list. This well-constructed fortress withstood the Avar assaults and was still referred to in the late sixth and seventh centuries.

Excavations carried out at Dinogetia in the south of Scythia on the right bank of the Danube have produced similar results. At various places in the citadel, especially on the west side and outside the surrounding wall, about fifteen fragments of bricks were discovered, all carrying a stamp with the name of Anastasius in relief.¹⁶⁹ The bricks belong mainly to the basilica and towers at the south-west angle of the citadel, thus implying that Anastasius concentrated specifically on restoration work in this area.¹⁷⁰ There is also evidence that the town plan of the fort was modified during a general rehabilitation of the site under Anastasius. Anastasian coins and lamps of the fifth–sixth century have been excavated, and it has been suggested that the fort, built at the beginning of the fourth century and destroyed at the end of the fourth century or beginning of the fifth, was repaired, firstly under Anastasius and then under Justinian. Noviodunum, standing thirty kilometres along the Danube from Dinogetia, also yielded brick stamps bearing the legend

+imp]ERATOR ANASTA[sius].

During further excavations here a series of Byzantine coins, running from Anastasius to Phocas, was discovered.¹⁷¹ A basilica, excavated properly in 1956 when the usually flooded site was under less water than usual, was found to be of the fifth or sixth century, possibly from the time of Anastasius.¹⁷²

Procopius attributes improvements to Ulmetum (in the interior of Scythia)¹⁷³ and Beroe (on the Thracian plain)¹⁷⁴ to Justinian, but again it is hard to find archaeological proof that the restoration was entirely the work of the later emperor. Procopius does not mention that the work was probably already underway by the time Justinian turned his attention to it, but at the south gate a bronze coin of Anastasius was found.¹⁷⁵ Sacidava, situated on a high hill on the right bank of the

¹⁶⁹ On Dinogetia in general, see Barnea (1971) 346–347 and for more details about these brick fragments, Barnea (1960) 366, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 263.

¹⁷⁰ On this basilica discovered in 1951/1952, see Barnea (1958) 337–339 and Scorpan (1980) 23ff.

¹⁷¹ Barnea (1971) 349ff, and Scorpan (1980) 18ff.

¹⁷² Barnea (1958) 339–341.

¹⁷³ Proc. de Aed. IV.7.18. For the general history of Ulmetum, Scorpan (1980) 41–44.

¹⁷⁴ Proc. de Aed. IV.11.19.

¹⁷⁵ See Hoddinott (1975) 312ff for further details. The restoration work cannot be

Danube, also had an Anastasian phase. The initial defensive wall erected in the fourth century and destroyed in the middle or second half of the fifth was repaired by Anastasius (and again in the second half of the sixth). In level III of the stratigraphy of the site, in a burned layer near the fortress wall, were discovered two fragments of bricks bearing the stamp of Anastasius.¹⁷⁶ There is also evidence of Anastasius' intervention at Ratiana (Dacia Ripensis) where an inscription placed over the city gates records:

+Anastasiana Ratiaria semper floreat¹⁷⁷

Lastly, the site of Vavova Kale, a ruined fort on Kotel Mountain, also provides evidence of building activity during the Anastasian years. Remains of outer and inner fortifications, ruins of buildings and early Byzantine ceramics (as well as twelfth- to fourteenth-century pottery) have been found here.¹⁷⁸ In the 1960s, a Latin inscription carved on a stone block which had originally been part of the wall or building was discovered. On side A the inscription reads "in indiction 6 (or 7) of the reign of Anastasius"¹⁷⁹ and below is carved the upper body of a human figure wearing a low crown, holding in the left hand a long cross, and in the right hand, an orb depicted as a hanging bag, as described by Velkov and Lisicov. On side B, there is a whole figure; the torso is represented as a square, the right hand holds the upper part of a cross, the left, an indefinable object.¹⁸⁰ Although both drawings are very primitive, they are clearly representations of the emperor holding the symbols of imperial power¹⁸¹ and obviously mark the erection of a new construction or repairs to the fort. Dating to between 497 and 513, the building activity at this site fits the pattern of improvements to fortifications already seen. After the series of Bulgar attacks in the 490s

securely dated on the evidence of the Anastasian coin, but Barnea (1960) portrays a general trend of Anastasius beginning work on these sites which was then continued by Justinian. He argues further (p.373), that as two coins of Anastasius were found at the sites of Aegissus and Troesmis and none of Justinian, Anastasius must be solely responsible for all work carried out; contra Procopius who attributes the establishment of both forts to Justinian, *de Aed.* IV.7.20 and IV.11.20.

¹⁷⁶ Scorpan, (1980) 50ff.

¹⁷⁷ Further details, Velkov (1985) 886–891, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 263.

¹⁷⁸ For further details on the geography of the site and for a description, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 257–259.

¹⁷⁹ *Indictione* ζ (or ς) *Anastasii*; the carving of the ζ or ς is unclear, meaning the inscription was carved either in the sixth indiction (1st September, 497 – 31st August, 512) or the seventh (498–512).

¹⁸⁰ For descriptions, with drawings and photographs, Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 260, 262.

¹⁸¹ Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 261–263 with n.8–10 note the similarities between these representations and the image of Anastasius on a silver coin issued in Constantinople in the early years of his reign.

and in 502, and in conjunction with the work on the Long Wall, Anastasius began a programme of rehabilitation of defences along the Danube *limes*, the Black sea coast and in the interior of Moesia II and Scythia, which was continued and completed by Justin and Justinian.

Although the necessity for such defences pointed to imperial weakness in the Balkans and an increasing reliability on defensive, rather than offensive, measures, these were flaws which had developed from the third century, and were not of Anastasius' making. He lacked the huge military resources which would have been necessary to defend imperial territory in the Balkans. Most of the army was occupied in the east, and there were ever increasing numbers of barbarians seeking opportunities to seize captives, booty, and land from the empire. The building of the Long Wall and the improvements to cities and forts in the Balkans provided a sensible and often effective solution to the logistical and military problem of defending the frontier provinces and especially the approach to Constantinople. On the other hand, the discovery of several large structures, particularly basilicas, points not only to defensive action on Anastasius' part, but also to promotion and development of a prosperous town-life.¹⁸² Although, for Anastasius, the eastern provinces clearly represented the main focus of his interest, the west was not to be neglected, and he displayed the same concerns for diplomacy and sound economic principles as he did towards the east.¹⁸³ His strategy for establishing the position of Theoderic in Italy ensured that the latter's status was regulated and he developed useful diplomatic ties with the Franks and Burgundians. Anastasius' contribution to the security of the Balkan region again shows a sound use of imperial expenditure. However, theology remained the exception on which Anastasius would not compromise, for while the political and military interests of the west were necessary to the safety of the empire as a whole, the religious persuasion of popes in Rome and the bishops in the Balkans was not only at odds with the rest of the empire, it was positively dangerous to imperial security. And Anastasius became increasingly convinced throughout his reign that communion with Rome would have to be sacrificed for the sake of unity in the east.

¹⁸² Evidence for the construction of monumental public buildings and repairs to the fort walls have been found at the Byzantine city of Caravec (modern Veliko Târnovo); Velkov and Lisicov (1994) 264. See also the conclusions of Barnea (1958) 347–349 and Scorpan (1980) *passim*.

¹⁸³ Anastasius' policy towards the west meant that he maintained the boundaries of the empire without trying to reconquer any part: for example, he respected the earlier 475 treaty between Constantinople and the king of the Vandals, Thrasamund, who addressed him as "friend".

5

RELIGIOUS POLICY: THE SEARCH FOR COMPROMISE

Anastasius inherited an empire in schism. Divisions within the church were hardly new but since the reign of Constantine when Christianity became the state religion, the politics of the church had become increasingly linked with the politics of the state. Emperors saw that disunity within the church often led to disunity and instability within the secular affairs of the empire.¹ Riots, whipped up by fanatical monks, caused disruption in the cities and were harmful to financial, political and social security, while disaffected communities on the empire's frontiers were more likely to desert to the enemy during times of war. However, although interference in church politics and in settlement of doctrine by emperors was not uncommon, it was often greatly resented by the church, and especially by the pope as the head of the church.²

The suspicion and antagonism displayed by Gelasius, Symmachus and Hormisdas, insistent on adherence to the Council of Chalcedon and firm in their belief in their own superiority over the emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople, affected Anastasius' handling of diplomatic relations with Theoderic and the west. As the consideration of dealings between Anastasius and Theoderic in the previous chapter showed, the popes, who would not sacrifice their principles to put an end to the Acacian schism, were able to exploit the worsening relationship between the emperor and the Gothic leader. This was true especially after 506/507 when Theoderic eventually decided to back Symmachus rather than the pro-*Henoticon* Laurentius. Distrust and resentment in Constantinople increased during the years of conflict

¹ Cf. Meyendorff (1989) 28–38.

² Constantine set the example of 'caesaropapism' by calling the Council of Nicaea in 325, interfering in the Arian conflict, and settling the Donatist dispute in Africa. There are numerous examples of the papal indignation against imperial interference in sacred matters (e.g. St. Ambrose; cf. Meyendorff (1989) 37f).

with Vitalian,³ yet although undoubtedly Anastasius appeared to make certain diplomatic overtures to Rome (such as the Synod of Heraclea in 515 to which the pope was invited), it is clear that the emperor would never subordinate the interests of the east to those of the west. In terms of foreign and economic policy, Anastasius could not risk causing disaffection among the eastern provinces, and while personal belief in monophysitism was obviously a factor, the favouring of monophysitism over Chalcedonianism can also be explained as pragmatic, an attempt not to alienate Egypt (crucial for the economy) or those on the border with Persia (crucial for the security of the empire during a period of Persian aggression).

Council of Chalcedon: Background and Aftermath

The schism which endured throughout Anastasius' reign was, ironically, the product of various unsuccessful attempts to achieve unity. The background is complex and the origins of conflict can be traced back to the beginning of the fifth century and even to the fourth, when Arius, ■ presbyter at Alexandria, denied the consubstantiality (*homoousios*) of the Father and Son. This belief was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 381 when the views of Apollinaris, the bishop of Laodicea, were also considered to be heretical. Apollinaris had countered Arianism by emphasising the divine element of Christ over and above the human element; Christ was God incarnate and the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God, the *theotokos*. In 428, Nestorius, a presbyter in Antioch, was appointed patriarch of Constantinople by Theodosius II in the hope that he would heal the divisions in the local church. However, Nestorius had attended the school of Antioch founded by Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia who, along with Ibas, the bishop of Edessa, argued against the definition of Apollinaris and produced a definition of Christ as a union of two natures. According to them, Christ possessed one *prosopon* (person) but two *phuseis* (natures), divine and human; the divine and human natures were separate but "united by will and grace so completely as to form one person".⁴ The Virgin Mary gave birth to the human Christ and was therefore the Mother of Christ, but not the Mother of God (the *theotokos*).

In this belief, however, Nestorius clashed with both the Empress

³ Vitalian was fighting under the banner of orthodoxy; see below, pp. 164ff.

⁴ Frend (1972) 13.

Pulcheria and the powerful patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril (c.378–444). The Council of Ephesus, called by the Emperor Theodosius II in 431, was dominated by supporters of Cyril, and Nestorius was condemned as ■ heretic and deposed. Even so, he continued to warn against confusing the human and the divine in Christ, though he reluctantly accepted the term *theotokos*. Through skilful propaganda on the part of Cyril and the Alexandrians, Nestorius became known for holding heretical views and he was credited with various beliefs (such as 'Christ was mere man') that he had expressly denied in his writings.⁵ However, although it seemed that Cyril had triumphed in his conflict with Nestorius, his own teachings were also regarded with suspicion. It was thought that he emphasised the divine element in Christ to such an extent that he could be accused of Apollinarianism, and that his terminology was vague and inconsistent, leading to even further confusion.⁶ Thus, in the June of 431, Cyril himself was excommunicated by John, the patriarch of Antioch, who saw the language of Cyril's theology, including the famous *Twelve Chapters* he had composed for Nestorius to anathematise, as dangerously ambiguous. Another formula was prepared which tried to bridge the differences between the Alexandrian and Antiochene doctrines. Cyril agreed to this new formula, in which Christ was said to be "of (ἐκ) two natures", and duly signed it.

One of the main consequences of this confusion was the case of Eutyches, an aged archimandrite, who directed ■ large monastery in Constantinople and had gained great influence over the emperor in spiritual matters. By 447, through a misunderstanding of Cyril, Eutyches had come to believe in an extreme form of monophysitism denied even by the monophysites themselves, which challenged the view that Christ's humanity was 'consubstantial' with man's.⁷ Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, called a local synod and summoned Eutyches to defend himself. Although he modified his rejection of dyophysite Christology to an assertion of "two natures before the union, one after it", Eutyches was deposed.⁸ However, he enjoyed the support of Cyril's successor in Alexandria, Dioscorus, who was keen to support Eutyches against the accusations of Flavian, patriarch of the rival and ambitious

⁵ Cyril succeeded in turning both the pope and the emperor against Nestorius. Theodosius exiled his former patriarch to Petra and then to the Great Oasis in the Egyptian desert and by 435 had ordered his writings to be burned. Even Antiochians, such as Theodoret of Cyrrhus, were forced to anathematise him.

⁶ Indeed both the Chalcedonians (supporters of the 'two natures' in Christ theory) and the Monophysites (supporters of the 'one nature' theory) would claim they were following Cyril's teaching. See discussion by Frend (1972) 12–14, 19.

⁷ Frend (1972) 30.

⁸ Frend (1972) 32.

see of Constantinople. Meanwhile, although the pope had sided with Cyril against the patriarch of Constantinople in 431, by 449 Rome perceived Alexandria as an equal threat. Consequently, the pope at that time, Leo, stood against Dioscorus and in a famous letter to Flavian, known as the *Epistula Dogmatica*, or *Tome of Leo*, laid down his profession of faith that in Christ, there were two natures, one personality. He also, however, criticised Flavian for the way he had dealt with Eutyches.

Eutyches and his supporters queried the propriety of the conduct of the proceedings and their appeal to the emperor resulted in the holding of the Second Council of Ephesus in 449. Dioscorus, however, held complete control and, supported by imperial representatives, he could afford to ignore the papal legates, and the *Tome of Leo* was never read. Eutyches was reinstated and Flavian deposed. A 'one nature' Christology was established as orthodoxy and the leading exponents of the Antiochene movement were condemned, including Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa. The reaction of Rome was one of outrage: the gathering at Ephesus was denounced as the *Latrocinium* or 'Robber Council' and the pope demanded another synod to be held in Italy. The emperor refused and Dioscorus excommunicated the pope.⁹

However, the tide was turning in the east and with the sudden death of Theodosius in July, 450, and the accession of Pulcheria with Marcian, the situation was suddenly reversed. Eutyches was exiled, Flavian's body was brought back to Constantinople and his name inscribed on the diptychs, and at the Council of Chalcedon, Dioscorus was deposed. As a further indication of the desire for reversal, the fourth Oecumenical Council was summoned to meet at the martyrion of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon in October, 451.¹⁰ About five hundred and twenty bishops attended. The first session was devoted to a careful examination of the records of Flavian's synod against Eutyches in 448 and of the Robber Council of 449. Dioscorus maintained his position that "Christ was fully God and fully man, and therefore of 'two natures' but, after the union, it was not possible to speak of these 'two natures' as distinctly subsisting, because their *union* into one being was a perfect union".¹¹ He argued that a discrepancy existed between Cyril who spoke of "*one nature* incarnate of God the Word" and Flavian who spoke of "two natures after the Incarnation".¹² However, those who had

previously supported Dioscorus now turned against him and the imperial commissioners decided that the condemnation of Flavian had been unjust. Dioscorus stayed away from the subsequent sessions despite repeated summons to appear and, during the third session, was deposed. Significantly, the deposition was on purely disciplinary grounds, not doctrinal; the Council did not wish to depart from the general tenor of Cyril's beliefs.

But concern to redress the injustice of the Council of Ephesus was not the only aim of the Council of Chalcedon. The goal for Pulcheria and Marcian was a new definition of faith which would clarify the previous anomalies and also the recent confusion created by Nestorius, Cyril, Eutyches and Dioscorus and their supporters. The Nicene Creed was no longer a relevant point of reference to solve these new difficulties and contradictions arising from them, and the imperial couple hoped that a new definition would provide guidelines which would now secure the unity of the Church. A great deal of debate and argument then ensued, during which even the *Tome of Leo*, the document which had been suppressed by Dioscorus at the Council of Ephesus, was considered to contain certain heretical views. The *Tome* used the formula "two natures after the incarnation" and stated that Christ was consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father in the godhead and consubstantial with us in humanity.¹³ Leo wrote that "one can say that the Son of God was crucified and buried, because one understands that there is a unity of person in both natures"¹⁴ and also that "two natures are united without change, without division and without confusion in Christ".¹⁵ At the session held on 22nd October in front of the imperial commissioners, the papal legates, the archbishops of Antioch and Jerusalem and fifty two other bishops, the patriarch of Constantinople, Anatolius, produced a draft definition of faith affirming that Mary was the *theotokos* and defining Christ as a union of *two natures*, thus following Cyril's terminology. The papal legates, who had already stated that the *Tome of Leo* constituted a definition of faith and that there was no need for another to be produced by the eastern bishops, argued that at the very least the new definition must be in agreement with that of Leo. Despite protests from the eastern bishops who declared themselves satisfied with the definition of Anatolius, on the order of Marcian, who was still seeking a definitive statement aimed at satisfying the disparate parties, a new formula taking into account both

⁹ For a detailed account of the Council of Ephesus 449, Frend (1972) 39–43.

¹⁰ There are many accounts of the Council of Chalcedon; see, for example, Frend (1972) esp. chapter 1, Gray (1979) chapter 2, and Meyendorff (1989) 167–187.

¹¹ Meyendorff (1989) 169.

¹² Meyendorff (1989) 170.

¹³ Most of the dissent resulted from problems with translation between Greek and Latin. For examples, Meyendorff (1989) 173.

¹⁴ Cf. Meyendorff (1989) 173.

¹⁵ Frend (1972) 4, with n.1.

the *Letters* of Cyril and the Tome of Leo was finally agreed and signed by the majority of bishops. The controversial section ran as follows:

Wherefore, following the holy fathers, we all with one voice teach that our Lord Jesus Christ is one and the same Son, the same perfect in divinity and the same perfect in humanity, truly God and truly man, the same consistent of ■ reasonable soul and body, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and the same consubstantial with us according to his humanity, similar to us in all things except sin; begotten of the Father before the ages according to his divinity, but the same begotten, in these last days, for us and for our salvation, from Mary the Virgin and Theotokos, according to his humanity; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the difference of his natures never being abolished because of their union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved and concurring into one person and one hypostasis, not as if He was parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, Only-Begotten, God, the Word, Jesus Christ; even as the prophets from ancient times spoke of Him, and as Jesus Christ Himself instructed us, and as the creed of the fathers handed down to us.¹⁶

While it was hoped that the compromise nature of this formula would satisfy the Alexandrians, Antiochenes and the west, there were many in the east who found even this definition unacceptable.¹⁷ These opponents of Chalcedon believed that in acknowledging that Christ was 'in two natures' (following Leo) rather than 'of two natures' (following Cyril), the definition went too far in separating the two natures of Christ, thus making Christ a 'mere man', the heretical viewpoint that had been wrongly associated with the teachings of Nestorius. It was

¹⁶ ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατέρεσιν ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκουμεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθινὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν κύριον μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μάλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ θεὸν λόγον κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξέπαιδευσεν καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. *Concillii Chalcedonensis Actio* V.34, in Schwartz (1933) 325–326 (tr. Meyendorff (1989) 177–178. Also translated by Frend (1972) 1–2).

¹⁷ Cf. Daley (1995) 34.

this division which led to the foundation of the great orthodox-monophysite debate which would continue throughout Anastasius' reign and beyond.

The Council of Chalcedon did not only deal with these doctrinal issues. Ecclesiastical order was also debated, most significantly in connection with the see of Constantinople. There had been a long-standing dispute between Constantinople and Ephesus; at Chalcedon two rival bishops of Ephesus who both demanded recognition were deposed, but the question of whether Constantinople had the right to ordain a new bishop was left open. The seniority of episcopal sees had been debated previously at the Council of Constantinople in 381, when it was decreed that Constantinople was second only to Rome. Then, and eighty years on, this position was disputed by those who believed that the apostolic sees, for example Alexandria, should have primacy. The ambitions of Alexandria itself were clear: her bishops "stroved to make themselves masters of Egypt and leaders of the church in the east". Rome's enthusiasm for questioning the pretensions of Constantinople was equally clear: "[Alexandria] relied on three powerful forces, on Greek piety and monasticism, on the masses of the lower classes, and on the Roman bishops, who had an equal interest in keeping down the bishops of Constantinople ...".¹⁸ However, the twenty-eighth canon of the 451 Council gave Constantinople the same privileges as Rome and authority to consecrate metropolitans of Asia Minor (including Ephesus), Pontus, Thrace, and land held by barbarians.¹⁹ The influence of Marcian and Pulcheria in promoting the primacy of the imperial see over Alexandria was clearly visible; but Old Rome, always jealous of its unequalled primacy as the see of St. Peter, was not keen to see Constantinople gaining such status and threatening such rivalry. The pope preferred to support Alexandria, the apostolic see of the east; the claims of Constantinople as an imperial city should not be allowed to compensate for the fact it was not an apostolic see. The authority of Constantinople in sacred matters was a sore point in relations between the east and the west and would eventually result in the Acacian schism.²⁰

The Council of Chalcedon was no different from any previous solution to religious strife in that it perpetrated and caused at least as many problems as it aimed to solve. As for the definition of faith, it

¹⁸ Harnack (1898) IV.191; cf. Charanis (1974) 32.

¹⁹ For further detail, see Meyendorff (1989) 181–182.

²⁰ For further discussion, Martin (1953) II.433–458, Frend (1972) 7–15, Meyendorff (1989) 179–184.

was "the product of an uneasy compromise".²¹ Regarded by Leo as absolute and binding, many bishops in the east still recognised only the Nicene Creed, confirmed by the Councils of Constantinople and Ephesus I, as the real exposition of faith. Some bishops and clergy, especially those at Constantinople, adopted the Chalcedonian formula merely in relief to be rid of Dioscorus, and to establish more firmly the ambitions of Constantinople over Alexandria. The establishment of the primacy of the imperial capital in the east was, on the other hand, rather less pleasing to Rome. Marcian's role in the Council also led to a consideration of the degree to which an emperor might interfere in the ecclesiastical sphere.

The greatest challenges to the Council came from the provinces of Palestine and Egypt. Indeed, the Egyptian monks refused to sign the definition of faith, fearing that they would be lynched on their return. After a period of confusion, the patriarch Proterius, who had replaced Dioscorus, was murdered, and the monophysite Timothy Aelurus (the Cat) was ordained. However, he was unable to unite the followers of Proterius and the monophysites. The new emperor, Leo, who had succeeded Marcian after his death in 457, was now encouraged by the pope to depose Timothy. Leo was able to take advantage of the unpopularity of Timothy Aelurus who was exiled and replaced by another Timothy (White Turban). But despite his moderation and attempts at reconciling the two parties, he was not accepted by the majority in Egypt who saw him merely as the emperor's tool and still felt that their views had not been taken into consideration at the Council of Chalcedon. In Palestine, it was the actions of the monks which constituted the greatest challenge. Led by the abbot Theodosius and supported by the empress Eudocia, widow of Theodosius II, the monks rebelled against the archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem who was prevented from returning to his see. Theodosius was ordained in his place, and several leading monophysites, including Peter the Iberian, were ordained bishops. As in Egypt, it was only through the intervention of Roman troops that the Chalcedonians were reinstalled.²²

Marcian and Pulcheria had hoped that the Council of Chalcedon would provide a formula in which all parties who had been swayed by the views of Arius, Nestorius, Cyril, Dioscorus and others would find common ground. The growing disunity in sacred matters would be halted and be prevented from spreading to the secular political sphere.

²¹ Frend (1972) 47.

²² Later Chalcedonian orthodoxy was promoted not only by force but by powerful monks such as St. Euthymius and St. Sabas.

It is clear, however, that the Council served only to accentuate the differences and to create two very distinct parties which led to even greater unrest and disaffection both within the eastern provinces and between the east and west. As time went on, the effects of the doctrinal schisms could be seen increasingly more clearly in the political landscape of the state.

The reign of Zeno exemplifies, on several levels, this growing trend. Doctrinal differences were manipulated by the usurper Basiliscus who, in order to establish his rule, set out to win the support of the monophysites. He issued an encyclical addressed to the deposed Timothy Aelurus stating that the definitions of faith as agreed at Nicaea and Ephesus were sufficient and that the formula devised at Chalcedon was an innovation. Timothy was welcomed in Constantinople where he revoked the twenty-eighth canon which had given the see of Constantinople supremacy over that of Ephesus. Strongly opposed by both the pope (on doctrinal grounds) and the patriarch of Constantinople (because of the insult to his see), Basiliscus hastily sent a counter-encyclical, reaffirming the rights of the patriarch of Constantinople and denouncing Nestorius, Eutyches and all other heretics. He dared make no reference to Chalcedon for over five hundred bishops had subscribed to his first encyclical.²³

The following years saw continued insecurity in all the major sees.²⁴ The new archbishop of Jerusalem circulated a document acknowledging only the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesus; Calendion, ordained patriarch of Antioch by Acacius, was prevented from taking up his position; and lastly, Egypt would accept only the appointment of the extreme anti-Chalcedonian Peter Mongus after the death of Timothy. In another attempt to resolve these problems, on 28th July, 482, Zeno addressed a letter to the bishops, clergy, monks and laymen of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis. Based on the advice of Acacius, the epistle was divided into three sections: firstly, affirming the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed as the only right and true testimony of faith; secondly, condemning Nestorius and Eutyches, and accepting the twelve anathemas of Cyril; and thirdly, adopting a doctrine regarding the nature of Christ which was favourable to the monophysites. Use of the problematic terms *hypostasis* and *prosopon* was avoided, as was the controversial 'in two natures', but Zeno asserted that Christ was consubstantial with both God and man, and maintained Cyril's view that "we say that both his miracles and his

²³ See e.g. Stein (1959) I.363–364, Frend (1972) 169–174, Meyendorff (1989) 196–197.

²⁴ For details, Frend (1972) 174–177.

sufferings which he willingly underwent in the flesh are of one person".²⁵ Anyone who disagreed should be anathematised. The Council of Chalcedon was ignored, rather than condemned. This epistle was the well-known *Henoticon*.²⁶

In that the *Henoticon* was designed to subdue the rumblings of discontent in the east and, in particular, to effect a reconciliation between Constantinople and Alexandria, it enjoyed a certain degree of success. Peter Mongus accepted it and became patriarch of Alexandria, although he subsequently faced severe opposition from the monks and was forced to anathematise the Council of Chalcedon and Tome of Leo. Calendion, the patriarch of Antioch, opposed it but, suspected of fraternising with Illus and Leontius against Zeno, was deposed and replaced by Peter Fuller, a supporter of the *Henoticon*. Martyrius of Jerusalem eventually accepted it too, as did many supporters of Chalcedon who were hopeful of establishing unity within the church. But while the eastern sees were ready to compromise, Rome could not accept a document which overruled the Chalcedonian definition of faith, and which had been imposed by imperial edict. On taking up office after the death of Simplicius in March, 483, Pope Felix III, alerted to the seriousness of the situation by the Sleepless Monks of Constantinople, demanded the ejection of Peter Mongus and the restoration of the definition of Chalcedon; and he sent a legation under Misenus, bishop of Cuma, and Vitalis, to make enquiries about the conduct of Acacius. However, the legation fell into a trap and took communion with Acacius, during which the names of Dioscorus and Peter Mongus were read from the diptychs. Meanwhile, on 28th July, 484, Felix III held a synod at which Acacius and Peter Mongus were excommunicated. In retaliation, Acacius removed the pope's name from the diptychs, and thus began the Acacian schism that was to endure thirty-five years.²⁷

²⁵ ἐνός γὰρ εἶναι φάμεν τὰ τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη, ἅπερ ἐκουσίως ὑπέμεινε σαρκί. Niceph. Call. XVI.12 (tr. Coleman-Norton (1966) 927; cf. Frend (1972) 18).

²⁶ For references to the extant versions of the *Henoticon* in Greek, Latin and Syriac, see Coleman-Norton (1966) 925. For discussion of the *Henoticon*, see e.g. Salaville (1920), Stein (1949) II.31–39, Capizzi (1969) 57 with n.34 and 101ff with n.54, Frend (1972) 177–183, Charanis (1974) 43–44, Daley (1995) 35, and on the inherent inconsistencies, Meyendorff (1989) 198–199. Although the Tome and Chalcedon were not condemned, the Council was reduced to a disciplinary body for the anathematisation of Nestorius and Eutyches. See Frend (1972) 179 who terms it a "masterstroke of Acacian diplomacy", contra Capizzi (1969) 101 who refers to the tortuous and ambiguous statements of Acacius.

²⁷ *Liber Pontificalis* I.252–253, with Brezzi (1936) 324–325, Frend (1972) 81–183 and Charanis (1974) 44.

The Accession of Anastasius

The *Henoticon* had stood as the official policy of Zeno and, despite increasing pressure for an outright acceptance or rejection of the Chalcedonian definition of faith, it continued, on the whole, as the basis for Anastasius' religious policy. As Severus, the extreme monophysite patriarch of Antioch, was to write in a letter to the bishop Solon: "To the pious king, [the *Henoticon*] was necessary for the general union of the churches, since he was desirous of showing that the king who preceded him also had before him the object of bringing into union those who separated on account of the Synod of Chalcedon ...".²⁸

However, although Anastasius undoubtedly held his own strong personal beliefs, far more significant than doctrinal niceties was the political unity of the empire. At the outset of his reign, two points were clear: in general, that disunity in ecclesiastical affairs would quickly lead to disunity in secular affairs; and in particular, that the interests of the empire, in terms of security and economic prosperity, lay in the east. The continuing schism with the church of Rome would be the price for Anastasius' attempt to achieve the communion of all four eastern patriarchs. It was the failure to heal the schism with the pope, along with his actions in deposing those patriarchs who stood in his way and his increasing anti-Chalcedonian interpretation of the *Henoticon* under the influence of the extreme monophysites, Severus of Antioch and Philoxenus of Mabbög, which would lead to criticism of Anastasius' religious policy.

The difficulty of Anastasius' position is clear, however, when we consider that it was not long before the immediate achievement of the *Henoticon*, the union of the eastern sees, began to fracture.²⁹ As Evagrius wrote, by the time of Anastasius: "Consequently it came about that there were very many divisions both in the East and in the western regions and in Libya, since the Eastern bishops were not on terms with those in the West or in Libya, nor in turn were the latter with those in the East. The situation became more absurd. For the prelates of the East were not even in communion with each other, nor indeed were those directing the sees of Europe or Libya, and much less so with outsiders".³⁰ By the beginning of the 490s, the most significant

²⁸ Sel. Let. I:2.

²⁹ For more details regarding the eastern provinces, see Bardy (1948) 299–301 and Frend (1972) 184–190.

³⁰ ἐντεῦθεν πλεῖστα τμήματα κατὰ τε τὴν ἑῶν ἀνά τε τὰ ἐσπέρια μέρη καὶ κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην ἐτύγχανον ὄντα, οὔτε τῶν ἑῶν ἐπισκόπων τοῖς ἐσπερίοις ἢ τοῖς Λίβυσι σπενδομένων οὔτε αὐτῶν τοῖς ἑσίοις. Τὸ δὲ μείζον' εἰς ἀποτίαν προήει. Οὐδὲ γὰρ

partisans of the *Henoticon*, including Peter Fuller, Peter Mongus, Acacius and the emperor Zeno, had died. For a brief four months, the patriarchate of Constantinople was held by Fravitta, who, in his short office, tried to effect a general reconciliation; but he succeeded in satisfying no one.

The capital's desire for a pious Chalcedonian emperor was manifested in the calls to Ariadne to choose an 'orthodox emperor'.³¹ But although he was certainly pious,³² there were doubts over the new emperor's past religious convictions. It is impossible to judge from contemporary or later sources Anastasius' beliefs, since the picture presented often reflects the author's own predisposition. Theophanes referred to him as "the one who rules wickedly" and the *Histoire Nestorienne* claimed that the people were agitated and asked how he could reign over them when he was so wrong about the nature of God.³³ Paul the Deacon similarly remarked that Anastasius had been tainted with the heresy of Eutyches.³⁴ On the other hand, he was praised by Zachariah of Mytilene, a close friend and supporter of the monophysite Severus. Zachariah related how Anastasius' accession to the throne was predicted by a certain John Scholasticus who cited the future emperor's virtues, including his desire to carry out the will of God.³⁵ More surprising, perhaps, is the praise of the orthodox Evagrius, who commented on Anastasius' peaceful disposition and how he was averse to changes in the church. Thus, Chalcedonianism was neither openly proclaimed nor repudiated. It is true that Anastasius removed bishops who were agitators, hence the exile of Euphemius, Macedonius

and Flavian; though, conveniently, they were also in opposition to his own views.³⁶

It was well known that, although many of Anastasius' immediate relatives were Chalcedonian, other members of his family were not: "The Manichaeans and Arians were delighted with Anastasius, the Manichaeans because the emperor's mother was a zealous devotee of theirs, the Arians because his uncle Klearchos, the brother of his impious mother, shared their beliefs".³⁷ Furthermore, a rumour circulating widely at the time, told how the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemius, had driven the future emperor out of the church where he was preaching presumably monophysite views, overturning his chair and threatening to tonsure his head and parade him through the streets.³⁸ Such was Euphemius' suspicion that he demanded from Anastasius a written profession of faith promising to follow the Chalcedonian creed and not to introduce any innovation, thus trying to ensure security and continuity within the church.³⁹ Euphemius was a convinced Chalcedonian and on his consecration he wrote to Pope Felix III to notify him of his election.⁴⁰ He refused communion with the monophysite Peter Mongus of Alexandria and removed his name from the diptychs.⁴¹ But while Euphemius fought battles with the monophysite east, he himself was not accepted by Rome. When Felix demanded the removal of Acacius' name from the diptychs, Euphemius, refusing to allow the slight on the authority of the see of Constantinople, would not comply.⁴²

οφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκοινωνοῦν οἱ τῆς ἐφῶας πρόεδροι, οὐδὲ μὴν οἱ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἢ τῆς Λιβύης τοὺς θρόνους διέποντες, μήτι γε δὴ καὶ ὑπερορίοις. Evag. III.30 (tr. Whitby). See also Theoph. AM 5982, who lists the bishops who fell victim to the *Henoticon*.

³¹ ὀρθόδοξον βασιλέα. *de Cer.* 1.92. At Constantinople, there was always an orthodox majority. Monks (e.g. the 'Sleepless Ones') proved to be effective agitators against any imperial policy contrary to their interests. The potential power of the monks was noted by Baynes (1926) 148 (quoted by Charanis (1974) 47): "The voice of the monk was what the press is today, and with their religious slogans the monks produced the same effect as modern newspapers with their political war cries".

³² In Anastasius' defence to all accusations and slurs on his conduct in the doctrinal dispute, at his coronation the crowd shouted: "Reign as you have lived. You have lived piously, reign piously". ὡς ἔζησας, οὕτω βασιλεύσον. εὐσεβῶς ἔζησας, εὐσεβῶς βασιλεύσον. *de Cer.* 1.92. Earlier in his career, he had been shortlisted for the patriarchate of Antioch; cf. Theod. Lect. 445, Theoph. AM 5983, Vict. Tun. 491, Niceph. Cal. XVI.20, with Gray (1979) 34.

³³ Ἀναστάσιος ὁ σιλεντιάριος ὁ κακῶς βασιλεύσας. Theoph. AM 5983 (tr. Mango and Scott); *Hist. Nest.* X.

³⁴ *Hic [Anastasius] Romani decus imperii Eutychianae haereseos inluvie maculavit.* Paul, *Hist. Rom.* XVI.2; cf. Frend (1972) 191.

³⁵ Zach. of Myt. VII.1.

³⁶ These exiles also refute Evagrius' own statement that bishops were allowed to act according to their own opinions; Evag. III.30, with Allen (1981) 145–147.

³⁷ Μανιχαῖοι δὲ καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον ἐπὶ Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως ζηλωτρίας οὐσης καὶ προσφιλοῦς αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον αὐτοῦ, ἀδελφὸν τῆς κακόφρονος μητρὸς, ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες. Theoph. AM 5983 (tr. Mango and Scott), Theod. Lect. 448.

³⁸ Theod. Lect. 441, Theoph. AM 5982, Georg. Mon. 623–624.

³⁹ This document was kept in the archives at the Great Church, guarded by the treasurer and future patriarch of Constantinople, Macedonius; Theod. Lect. 446, Evag. III.32, Vict. Tun. 491, Theoph. AM 5983, Cedr. 626, Georg. Mon. 624. Frend (1979) 184 suggests that Anastasius might have turned the profession of faith to his own advantage, arguing that his control over the Church should be more acceptable since his faith had been acknowledged by the Chalcedonian patriarch; instead the emperor came to regard it as a slight to his authority. On Euphemius' actions, Zon. XIV.3.5–8; Le Quien (1740) 1.219, Smith and Wace (1880) II.292, Salaville (1920) 61, Duchesne (1925) 2–4, Bardy (1948) 301, Janin (1963b) 1410f and Grillmeier (1987) II.1.264–266.

⁴⁰ Originally from Apamea, Euphemius directed a hospital near Constantinople before becoming patriarch in 490. For his synodical letter to Felix, see Zach. of Myt. VII.1, Theoph. AM 5983, Niceph. Cal. XVI.19, Grumel (1932) 132 and Frend (1979) 184.

⁴¹ Peter Mongus disagreed openly with the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon; Grumel (1932) 132.

⁴² cf. Theod. Lect. 442, Theoph. AM 5983, Niceph. Cal. XVI.19.

Relations with the Popes

Gelasius

Throughout Anastasius' reign there were sporadic attempts to end the deadlock in relations between the imperial capital and the apostolic see. As we saw in chapter three, politics and religion were closely linked at the beginning of the 490s and would become more so throughout the reign as the attempt to unite the churches of the east and west became part of the political package in defining the constitutional position of Theoderic. However, as was evident in the previous chapter, it appears that the western church had little interest in helping to heal the political divide and adopted a far more severe attitude towards an emperor who adhered to the *Henoticon* than towards the Arian Theoderic. The new pope, Gelasius, was even more intransigent on the subject of Acacius than his predecessor and indeed, there is reason to believe that it was Gelasius who had encouraged Felix III in a hardline stance against the pretensions of the east.⁴³ He was also responsible for several works against Acacius, such as the *De damnatione nominum Petri et Acacii*,⁴⁴ and was assiduous in his correspondence with the bishops of Gaul and the Balkans on the same subject.⁴⁵ In a letter to Rusticus, bishop of Lyons, written in 494, he expresses his pleasure at the union with the Gallic bishops and also his distress over the Acacian schism.⁴⁶ In his correspondence with the bishops of Dardania and Illyricum, he encouraged eastern heretics to return to the true faith. He broke off communion with the bishop of Thessalonica who would not condemn Acacius⁴⁷ and despatched a letter justifying why Acacius had been condemned by Rome.⁴⁸

On his ordination as pope, Gelasius wrote the customary letter to Anastasius announcing his election⁴⁹ to which, it seems, he received no reply; ostensibly because he had sent no letter to Euphemius. Only later

did he write to the patriarch,⁵⁰ after receiving two letters in which Euphemius complained that he had received no letters of communion from the new pope.⁵¹ Euphemius expressed a strong desire for reconciliation, reminding the pope that Acacius had not been officially condemned by any synod. He insisted that the people of Constantinople would not allow the name of Acacius to be removed. Gelasius replied, refusing any compromise, and outlining his approval of the Council of Chalcedon, especially concerning the condemnation of Eutyches. He enquired why other Eutychians, namely Peter Mongus and Acacius, had not been similarly rejected. The main purport of the letter, however, was to establish firmly the supremacy of Rome. Here and elsewhere, Gelasius ignored the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon giving Constantinople pre-eminence over Alexandria and Antioch: he always placed them second and third after Rome, and he seldom referred to his own see without calling it "apostolic". In a letter to the Dardanian bishops, he insultingly alluded to the see of Constantinople as under that of Heraclea, the metropolitan of the province of Europa.⁵² According to him, Constantinople had no greater claim to primacy than the other centres of imperialism outside Rome; namely, Ravenna, Milan, Sirmium or Trier: "It is ridiculous that they wish to give a prerogative to Acacius on the ground that he is bishop of the Imperial City. Is it not true that the Emperor resided at various times in Ravenna, Milan, Sirmium and Trèves? ... If there is any question of the dignity due to cities, the dignity of the second and third see [Alexandria and Antioch] is greater than that of the city [Constantinople] which not only is not numbered among the [major] sees, but is not even enumerated among cities with metropolitan rights. But when you say "Imperial City", [remember that] there is a difference between the power of secular kingship and the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities".⁵³ Gelasius also

⁵⁰ Mansi (1762) VIII.5ff, Thiel (1868) 312ff and Jaffé (1885–1888) no.620.

⁵¹ In 494, Gelasius wrote to Anastasius explaining why he had not informed Euphemius of his election. He made polite excuses, remarking that such a letter was not compulsory and that the schism made such correspondence inappropriate; cf. Thiel (1868) 349–358, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.632, and Schwartz (1934) 19ff. Grisar (1912) II.214 wrote harshly about Anastasius: "Even in his dealings with so narrow-minded and tyrannical an emperor as Anastasius ... [Gelasius] was still courteous."

⁵² Thiel (1868) 392–414, esp. 398, Gunther (1895–1898) no.95.

⁵³ *risimus autem, quod praerogativam volunt Acacio comparari, quia episcopus fuerit regiae civitatis. numquid apud Ravennam, apud Mediolanum, apud Sirmium, apud Triveros multis temporibus non constitit imperator? ... si certe de dignitate agitur civitatum, secundae sedis et tertiae maior est dignitas sacerdotum quam eius civitatis, quae non solum inter sedes minime numeratur sed nec inter metropolitanorum iura censetur. nam quod dicitis "regiae civitatis", alia potestas est regni saecularis, alia ecclesiasticarum distributio dignitatum.* (tr. Dvornik (1958) 112).

⁴³ See the *Liber Pontificalis* I.252f, Brezzi (1936) 325ff, and Dvornik (1958) 110, 116.

⁴⁴ Gelasius is often described as uncompromising, verbose and rigorous in his reasoning, especially on his favourite subjects, the primacy of Rome and the final outcome on the Day of Judgement. See especially Thiel (1868) 320, Schwartz (1934) 49ff, with Grisar (1912) II.213ff, Duchesne (1925) 12–13, Frend (1972) 193ff and Grillmeier (1987) II.1.292–305.

⁴⁵ The Balkans were subject to pressure from both orthodox Rome and the east which was in favour of the *Henoticon* and monophysitism; cf. Duchesne (1892) 544ff.

⁴⁶ Thiel (1868) 358–359.

⁴⁷ Mansi (1762) VIII.46f, Thiel (1868) 382ff and Jaffé (1885–1888) no.638.

⁴⁸ Mansi (1762) VIII.50ff, 63ff, Thiel (1868) 392ff, 414ff, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.664.

⁴⁹ Jaffé (1885–1888) no.619.

stated that patriarchs and bishops could only be judged by the pope, who held jurisdiction over the whole church.⁵⁴ Naturally, such claims were not received well in the east and in a letter to the senator Faustus, Gelasius complained that the easterners had called him "proud and arrogant". However, he made no secret of his contempt for Byzantium, writing to the bishops of Dalmatia and Dardania that "among the Greeks, there is no doubt that many heresies abound".⁵⁵

In 492, when Theoderic sent the embassy led by Faustus and Irenaeus to Anastasius to negotiate his new status,⁵⁶ Gelasius saw his opportunity for bringing to an end the Acacian schism. But conditions were not favourable for peace. Anastasius, offended by Gelasius' response to Euphemius, ordered his legates, despatched to Italy after Theoderic's capture of Ravenna, to avoid contact with the pope. In a motion of petty retaliation, Gelasius sent no letter of salutation to Anastasius with Faustus. Instead, he entrusted Faustus with negotiations about the schism, briefing him thoroughly with his *commonitorium*, in which he warns about the sly tricks of the Greeks and rejects their arguments. He wrote thus: "I too have learned that the Greeks will continue in their obstinacy... For they oppose the public agreement not so much on religious grounds, but rather because they seek, by means of the royal embassy, to undermine the Catholic faith and through such ■ design to fulfil their own hopes".⁵⁷ As seen previously (ch.4 p.81), it seems that Anastasius offered ■ compromise, proposing that he would recognise Theoderic as king of Italy in return for papal acceptance of the *Henoticon*.

Anastasius was obviously keen to establish ecclesiastical peace with Rome so that he could concentrate on affairs in the east. As noted in chapter four, a nod of recognition to Theoderic was not a large price to pay in return for the promise of a real union based on the unity of the church.⁵⁸ Anastasius' pragmatic response at this stage in proposing the

solution he hoped would most easily bring peace within the church and security to both halves of the empire, and leave him free to concentrate on other pressing concerns at the beginning of his reign (such as the Isaurian conflict and the restoration of the economy), could not succeed. Gelasius was bound to reject the offer. Papal recognition of the *Henoticon* implied ■ recognition of the emperor's right to decide matters of doctrine by edict. In his letter of 494, Gelasius set forth his belief that the spiritual authority of Rome also implied temporal power.⁵⁹

There are mainly two things, August emperor, by which this world is governed: the sacred authority (*auctoritas*) of the pontiffs and the royal power (*potestas*). Of these, priests carry a weight all the greater ... You know, most merciful son, that though you surpass the human race in dignity, yet you must bend a submissive head to the ministers of divine things and that it is from them that you must receive the conditions of your Salvation. And you know that in receiving the heavenly sacraments which it is within their competence to dispense, you know that [sic] you must rather obey the ministry of religion than rule it.⁶⁰

Gelasius reiterated in his fourth tractatus his belief that a secular leader had no role to play in ecclesiastical matters. He recalled how the emperors used to hold the title of Pontifex Maximus, but that God had separated the offices of king and pontiff and given them distinctive functions and status; "hence emperors are in need of pontiffs for their eternal life, and pontiffs must make use of imperial services for temporal necessities".⁶¹

⁵⁹ Thiel (1868) 349–358, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.632. Gelasius was persuaded to write to Anastasius by the senate of Rome, which was aware of the pro-Constantinople policy of Theoderic; cf. Brezzi (1936) 337.

⁶⁰ *duo quippe sunt, imperator auguste, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur: auctoritas sacra pontificum, et regalis potestas. in quibus tanto gravius est pondus sacerdotum ... nosti etenim, fili clementissime, quod licet praesideas humano generi dignitate, rerum tamen praesulibus divinarum devotus colla submittis, atque ab eis causas tuae salutis expectas, inque sumendis coelestibus sacramentis eisque ut competitis disponendis, subditi te debere cognoscis religionis ordine potius quam praeesse.* (tr. Dvornik (1951) 112–113; see also Charanis (1974) 51). The supremacy of Rome over Constantinople was a familiar theme of Gelasius' letters and appears in his treatise *Tomus de anathematis vinculo* (see below); cf. Smith and Wace (1880) II.618–619 and Schwartz (1934) 222ff. For a discussion on the definitions of *auctoritas* and *potestas*, see Dvornik (1951) 111–115, Dvornik (1966) 804–808 and Richards (1979) 21. Gelasius' reasoning on the *auctoritas* of the pope versus the *potestas* of the emperor was hardly new. Previously, Ambrose had placed the power of the Church over that of the emperor in his treatment of Valentinian I and Theodosius II. See further, Hoeflich (1975).

⁶¹ *ut et Christiani imperatores pro aeterna vita pontificibus indigerent, et pontifices pro temporalium cursu rerum imperialibus dispositionibus uterentur.* Fourth Tractatus, Thiel (1868) 557–570 (tr. Dvornik (1951) 114). Gelasius, however, was historically inaccurate in his argument that Christian emperors were the first to give up the title of

⁵⁴ This ideal is developed principally in three documents: the *commonitorium* to Faustus (Thiel (1868) 341ff), the letter to Anastasius (Thiel 349ff), and a long letter to the bishops of Dardania (Thiel 392ff). See further, Dvornik (1958) 113–118.

⁵⁵ *Apud Graecos, quibus multas haereses abundare non dubium est ...* Thiel (1868) 335f, Gunther (1895–1898), no.79.

⁵⁶ Hodgkin (1895) III.432–434, Pfeilschifter (1896) 22ff; cf. above, ch. 4, pp.81ff.

⁵⁷ *ego quoque mente percepi Graecos in sua obstinatione mansuros ... quapropter non tam propter religionis causas student dispositionibus publicis obviare, sed potius per occasionem legationis regiae catholicam fidem moluntur evertere, et tali commercio nituntur sperata praestare.* Thiel (1868) 341ff, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.622, Schwartz (1934) 16ff. (tr. Charanis (1974) 48–49).

⁵⁸ See Capizzi (1969) 103 with n.64 for Anastasius' preoccupation with the east; the patriarchates of the east were a far greater worry than the papacy of Italy which was farther away and further down the political agenda.

Anastasius II

Very different was the manner of the next pope, Anastasius II, who took up office on 24th November, 496 after the death of Gelasius.⁶² Anastasius, like his predecessors, had little intention of accepting the *Henoticon* or of dropping Rome's demand for the removal of Acacius from the diptychs. Yet his approach was far more conciliatory. With the second embassy of Theoderic early in 497 to Constantinople to renegotiate his status in Italy, headed this time by another senator, Festus, Anastasius II sent a letter with two bishops, Cresconius and Germanus. Anastasius was willing not only to be tactful but also to flatter the emperor in order to achieve the unity so urgently needed within the church. Thus he wrote that he desired an end to the schism and, unlike Gelasius, he attributed some influence in sacred matters to the *potestas* of the emperor.⁶³

The outcome of the negotiations was as follows: Festus obtained agreement for further celebrations in honour of the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul and the desired recognition of Theoderic as king of Italy. In return for these concessions he promised that he would persuade the pope to subscribe to the *Henoticon*.⁶⁴ While in Constantinople, Festus took the opportunity to meet with a delegation of Alexandrian emissaries. They, represented by the priest Dioscorus, emphasised the links between the sees of Peter and Mark:⁶⁵ unity was established based on Rome's presumed acceptance of the *Henoticon*, an acknowledgement by Alexandria of the supremacy of Rome and the removal of Acacius' name from the diptychs.

Meanwhile, the conciliatory approach of Anastasius II also

Pontifex Maximus; the emperor Gratian had been the first to do so. For the reaction of Gelasius' successors, see further Dvornik (1951) 115ff. Particularly ironical is the letter addressed to Theoderic by the bishops of the second synod during the Laurentian schism. They wrote: "It is therefore the concern of your *imperium* to see, on God's invitation, to the rehabilitation of the Church ... So we request you to come to the assistance, as a pious ruler, of our weakness and powerlessness, since the simplicity of the priests is not equal to the cunning of the laity" (*et ideo vestri erit imperii mutu dei prospicere ecclesiae redintegrationi, ... nunc rogamus ut infirmitatibus et debilitati nostrae sicut pii domini succurratis, quoniam calliditati saeculari sacerdotum simplicitas non sufficit*). *Acta Synodorum Habitarum Romae (Relatio Episcoporum ad regem, 9–12)*, tr. Dvornik (1951) 116. Hence, an example of bishops begging for the help of a heretical king to judge their pope.

⁶² cf. Grillmeier (1987) II.1.305–308.

⁶³ Mansi (1762) VIII.188ff, Thiel (1868) 615–623 and Jaffé (1885–1888) no.744.

⁶⁴ Despite apparent concord, it is noticeable that the emperor was still wary of the pope's intentions. He forbade the new patriarch of Constantinople, Macedonius, to send synodical letters to Rome.

⁶⁵ Thiel (1868) 628ff.

encouraged the bishop of Thessalonica, Andrew, who had, up to this point, been in communion with the church of Constantinople. He now published a letter of reconciliation he had received from the previous pope, Gelasius, anathematised Acacius and sent the deacon, Photinus, to Rome. However, in welcoming Photinus, Pope Anastasius antagonised many clergy of the city, who accused him of wishing to rehabilitate Acacius; and a number of priests broke communion with him in protest.⁶⁶

The Laurentian Schism

It is impossible to say whether Anastasius II would ever have been persuaded to break with the traditional stance of Rome and make amends with the east on the emperor's terms. Festus had acted entirely on his own initiative in his promise to Anastasius. However, on his return to Rome he learnt, to his dismay, of the pope's premature death.⁶⁷ In view of his agreement with Anastasius, it was imperative that the new pope be as mild and conciliatory as Anastasius II had been, and open to persuasion. Festus therefore promoted the election, by means of bribery and political intrigue, of the archpriest Laurentius.⁶⁸ However the majority, encouraged by Faustus, the senator who had headed Theoderic's first embassy to Constantinople, were in favour of the deacon, Symmachus, who held similar views to his patron, Gelasius. Both were consecrated on 22nd November, 498, Laurentius in the church of Santa Maria and Symmachus in the Lateran basilica. It is clear that a schism had been forming in Rome even before the demise of Anastasius II. The senate and clergy split into two factions, one supporting Gelasius' hardline stance against the east, and the other taking Anastasius' more conciliatory approach. The pro-Anastasian faction now transferred its sympathies to Laurentius but remained in the minority.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ See the account in the *Liber Pontificalis*, I.258–259.

⁶⁷ Theod. Lect. 461.

⁶⁸ Theod. Lect. 461, Landolfus *Sagax* XVII.216.

⁶⁹ Grisar (1912) 222 characterised this group as a faction of the clergy "consisting mainly of short-sighted men who were over-disposed to peace, and who really expected Anastasius II to subscribe to the *Henoticon*". This view, however, is somewhat biased. The Laurentian faction was composed of a group of senators, led by Probinus and Festus, who supported the idea of religious unity and were conscious of old ties with Constantinople. Moreover, they still disliked the rule of a "barbarian" Arian king. They were joined by others, including the deacon Pascasius, well known for his asceticism; cf. *Liber Pontificalis* I.260.

Both new popes desired the recognition of Theoderic and presented themselves at the court of Ravenna. Although he had fewer votes, Laurentius might have hoped for the king's support. After all, the bargain with the east required a pope amenable to the *Henoticon* in return for the restoration of the *ornamenta palatii*.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, as we have seen (above, pp.90–91), it seems that Theoderic was not to be dissuaded from his duty and duly picked Symmachus while Laurentius was conveniently despatched to take up position as bishop of Nuceria in Campania. His supporters in Rome, however, continued to agitate and in 501 Symmachus faced three accusations: not celebrating Easter properly, immoral intercourse with women and illegal alienation of church property. Theoderic, in response to demands of help from Rome, sent an episcopal Visitor, Peter of Altinum, but he was equally unsuccessful in resolving matters.⁷¹ In the course of 501, three synods were arranged. The first two never took place, but finally, on 23rd October, at a session known as the *synodus Palmaris*, an agreement signed by seventy-six bishops decreed that all the accusations against Symmachus were false.⁷² Notwithstanding this settlement, the rightful pope was left in virtual exile at the Vatican and Laurentius was recalled. Both he and the Visitor were excommunicated by Symmachus. A synod held in 502 tried further to restore order stating that “no layman can settle any church matter without the pope's leave”.⁷³ Yet the state of unrest, verging on civil war, continued in Rome, especially with Laurentius' conversion of the church of St. Paul into a rival of St. Peter's.⁷⁴ In 505, Theoderic was persuaded to intervene again: a synod was held at which one hundred and fifteen bishops confirmed Symmachus as their pope and Laurentius retired from the scene to a country estate belonging to Festus.

During Symmachus' time as pope, relations with the east

plummeted.⁷⁵ Much later, in 512, Symmachus was to write: “concerning the recent happenings in the church of Constantinople, I can only sigh and keep silence”.⁷⁶ Angered that his plans for the unity of the whole church and empire based on the *Henoticon* had been thwarted, Anastasius composed a *libellus*, a polemic against the pope. He accused him of being a Manichee, of conspiring with the senate to excommunicate him, and of “not being properly consecrated” (*nec ordine consecratus*). This letter of Anastasius is lost, but we do have Symmachus' reply, the *Apologeticus adversus Anastasium imperatorem*.⁷⁷ This *Apologeticus* is usually dated to 506 and it is generally assumed that it was only after the end of the Persian war that Anastasius was free to turn his attention to the unwelcome developments in Rome. However, the exchange of correspondence between the emperor and the pope could also fit the years 499–501 when Festus might have appealed to the emperor for assistance in the struggle to oust Symmachus and to organise a Roman party favourable to the *Henoticon*. It is also true that Anastasius' accusation *nec ordine consecratus* is less appropriate for 506 than for the earlier dates.⁷⁸

In the *Apologeticus*, Symmachus addresses Anastasius merely as “emperor” with none of the usual honorific titles. He rebuts Anastasius' charges against him, and justifies the continuation of the schism. He explains the old position on Acacius, reaffirms the nature of Christ as defined at the Council of Nicaea and in the Tome of Leo, and points out that the emperor's advocacy of Eutychian heresy does not help the situation: “You say that I am a Manichean. But am I a Eutychian or do I defend the Eutychians whose madness greatly strengthens the Manichean heresy?”⁷⁹ Gelasius' argument over the relative power of emperor and pope is recycled: “But let us compare the rank of an emperor with that of pontiff: the difference between them is only such

⁷⁰ Cf. above, ch. 4, pp.89ff. See Alessandrini (1944), Pfeilschifter (1896) 55ff on Theoderic's role, and Cessi (1920) 210ff on the *modus vivendi* of the Church of Rome and the government of Italy.

⁷¹ An episcopal visitor was usually sent when there was a vacancy, to take charge until a new bishop or pope was elected.

⁷² For more details on the aborted synods and on the *synodus Palmaris*, see Mansi (1762) VIII.230ff and Jaffé (1885–1888) nos.752ff; Smith and Wace (1887) IV.751–755, Grisar (1912) 241–243, Alessandrini (1944) 168ff. The *synodus Palmaris* caused much controversy as the principle that the pope was subject to no judge was contravened. See the letter of Avitus, bishop of Vienne: “If the authority of the Pope of Rome may be impugned, it is not one bishop but the whole episcopate which becomes unstable.” (*si papa urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus iam videbitur, non episcopos vacillare.*) ep.34 (tr. Grisar (1912) 244–245). See also Ennodius, *Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumpserunt*.

⁷³ Grisar (1912) 244.

⁷⁴ On this sedition, *Liber Pontificalis* 1.260–262.

⁷⁵ Amory (1997) 203ff notes that the parties in support of or against Symmachus and Laurentius did not divide along pro-eastern or anti-eastern lines, but that many other factional interests were involved and other issues were at stake, such as the question of secular control over ecclesiastical matters (as indicated in the quotation above), or the church's right to alienate ecclesiastical property. Amory therefore warns against dividing Roman secular and ecclesiastical politics along pro- and anti-eastern lines. However, the uncompromising attitude of Symmachus towards a reconciliation with the eastern church and an end to the Acacian schism was clearly a key issue. For further discussion on Symmachus, Grillmeier (1987) II.1.308–310.

⁷⁶ *quae in Constantinopolitana nuper ecclesia contigerunt, de quibus pariter mihi ingemescere necesse est et tacere*. Gunther (1895–1898) no.104 (tr. Charanis (1974) 87).

⁷⁷ Mansi (1762) VIII.213–217, Thiel (1868) 700–708, Schwartz (1934) 153–157, with 248–249; Capizzi (1969) 115, n.103.

⁷⁸ Cf. Alessandrini (1944) 166–167.

⁷⁹ *dicis esse me Manichaeum. numquid ego Eutychianus sum vel Eutychianos defendo, quorum furor maxime Manichaeorum suffragatur errori?*

that as the one looks after earthly things, so the other's concerns are godly. You, the emperor, receive baptism from the pontiff; from him you take the sacraments, ask for prayers, hope for a blessing, and apply for penance. To sum up, you administer human things, he dispenses to you the divine. And so, I wouldn't go so far as to say that [the pontifical] rank is greater, but certainly that it is equal [to the imperial rank].⁸⁰ He demanded of the emperor: "Think you that because you are emperor you need not fear God's judgement?"⁸¹ As with Gelasius, Symmachus indicated that he would rather be in communion with the Arian Theoderic than the monophysite Anastasius.⁸²

It is clear that with Symmachus' *Apologeticus* to Anastasius, so reminiscent of Gelasius' letter, little progress had been made in the reconciliation of the two halves of the empire.⁸³ The church under Symmachus remained firm on the old issues of Acacius, the supremacy of Rome and the authority of Chalcedon. Anastasius could not unbend on any of these issues, preoccupied as he was with instability in the east. With the opening of the Persian offensive in the early 500s the importance of securing the loyalty of the eastern provinces was paramount.

Anastasius and the East: the Deposition of Euphemius

Meanwhile, in Constantinople, the Patriarch Euphemius continued to advocate pro-Chalcedonian orthodoxy. In 492, he had written to Gelasius emphasising his loyalty to the Chalcedonian cause and proposing an end of the Acacian schism.⁸⁴ He also sought the assistance of the pope in deposing Athanasius II, the patriarch of Alexandria who had anthematized both the Tome of Leo and Council of Chalcedon. In the same year, he convened a local council at which the decrees of Chalcedon were confirmed.⁸⁵ This insistent promotion of the

Chalcedonian cause, his opposition to the monophysite version of the Trishagion,⁸⁶ and his possession of the document containing the emperor's profession of faith, were the main reasons for his deposition in 496.⁸⁷ However, as a pretext for his exile, Anastasius was able to cite not religious issues, but one of state security.⁸⁸ When he had asked Euphemius to instruct the bishops of Constantinople to pray for peace during negotiations with the Isaurians, Euphemius had passed this information on to John the patrician, father-in-law of Athenodorus, one of the leading rebels. John reported the patriarch's indiscretion to the emperor who, losing all patience, was then able to accuse Euphemius of consorting with the enemy.⁸⁹ An assassin (whether to curry favour or on Anastasius' order) drew his sword on the patriarch, but the blow was taken by Paul, a deacon, and the assassin was killed.⁹⁰

At any rate, bad feeling continued between the emperor and the patriarch and Anastasius continued to demand, with more urgency, the return of his profession of faith. A synod, called by the emperor in November, 496, found the patriarch guilty of Nestorianism and exiled him to a monastery in Euchaita.⁹¹ In fact, the accusation of Nestorianism had been levelled against Euphemius several years earlier by Athanasius II of Alexandria with help from Sallustius of Jerusalem, in retaliation for Euphemius plotting to bring about his downfall.⁹² Euphemius had survived this attack, but was not so fortunate in 496. The people of Constantinople, demonstrating in favour of Euphemius, were dispersed and Macedonius, an elderly and respected presbyter of the Great Church and guardian of the sacred treasure, was installed in his place.⁹³ He was a nephew of the former patriarch, Gennadius, who was, perhaps, selected by Ariadne and the senate in an attempt to cover up the injustice of the depose of Euphemius. He immediately signed

refusal to budge on the point of Acacius, Euphemius would have been content to let the rift be healed.

⁸⁰ This version was formulated by Peter Fuller who added "who was crucified for us" (ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς) Theoph. AM 5982. See further, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.40ff and Grumel (1932) 136.

⁸¹ It is unlikely, as often suggested, that Anastasius was annoyed at Euphemius' enthusiastic letters to Gelasius, as he himself promoted correspondence between pope and patriarch.

⁸² Cf. above ch. 1, p.25.

⁸³ Theod. Lect. 449–450, Theoph. AM 5987, Georg. Mon. 624–625, with Grumel (1932) 136.

⁸⁴ There was also an ambush to kill Euphemius at a liturgical gathering, but he escaped to safety in civilian clothes.

⁸⁵ Mal. 400, Mansi (1762) VIII.186.

⁸⁶ Zach. of Myt. VII.1, with Gray (1979) 35 and Frend (1979) 184.

⁸⁷ Theod. Lect. 455, Theoph. AM 5988. For details on the pious asceticism of Macedonius, see Smith and Wace (1882) III.777; on Macedonius generally, Grillmeier (1987) II.1.266–269.

⁸⁰ *conferamus autem honorem imperatoris cum honore pontificis: inter quos tantum distat quantum ille rerum humanarum curam gerit, iste divinarum. tu imperator a pontifice baptismum accipis, sacramenta sumis, orationem poscis, benedictionem speras, poenitentiam rogas. postremo tu humana administras, ille tibi divina dispensat. Itaque ut non dicam superior, certe aequalis honor est.* (tr. Dvornik (1966) 811–812, adapted). See Dvornik (1966) 811–812 for further discussion on this passage.

⁸¹ *an quia imperator es, nullum Dei putas esse iudicium?* (tr. Charanis (1974) 86–87).

⁸² Thiel (1868) 708f; cf. Amory (1997) 205f.

⁸³ With hindsight, Pope Anastasius II's more conciliatory approach seemed to some an aberration, but no doubt at the time there appeared to be a real chance of healing the breach.

⁸⁴ Mansi (1762) VIII.7; cf. Gray (1979) 35.

⁸⁵ Grumel (1932) 134, with a list of the relevant sources. Had it not been for Gelasius'

the *Henoticon*, which provided a satisfactory compromise for Athanasius and his colleagues.⁹⁴

Anastasius' haste in the dismissal of Euphemius can be explained by his concern not only at his staunch pro-Chalcedonian position but more seriously at his attempts to further destabilise the other eastern patriarchates. The patriarch's attempts to bring about the downfall of Athanasius with the help of the pope was particularly alarming. Egypt retained its strong adherence to monophysitism and even if he had wanted to, it would have been impossible for Anastasius to impose a pro-Chalcedonian belief.⁹⁵ In 496, Egypt gained a new monophysite champion in the appointment of the monk, John II, who openly anathematised both the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon.⁹⁶ Meanwhile, in Jerusalem there had also been a change of patriarch: Sallustius had died in 494 and was replaced by Elias, a staunch supporter of the Chalcedonian creed. He ceased to communicate with

⁹⁴ Theod. Lect. 456, Zach., *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.113, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.46, Theoph. AM 5988, 6004, Cedr. 628, Niceph. Cal. XVI.26, and Grumel (1932) 138.

⁹⁵ Egypt's preference for monophysitism has led to the belief in a link between religious conviction and nationalism. Vasiliev (1932) I.132, (quoted by Charanis (1974) 36) remarked: "The Egyptian Church abolished the use of Greek in its services and introduced the native Egyptian (Coptic) language. The religious disturbances in Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch ... assumed the character of serious national revolts and could be suppressed by the civil and military authorities only after much bloodshed".

However, the monophysites cannot be tied to one location and one social class in the same way that, for example, the Donatists could be. There is no hint of an anti-imperial rebellion in Alexandria, two centuries before the arrival of the Arabs. In Egypt it is true that rural communities in particular, which used the Coptic language, are identified with the heart of monophysitism, but as many Egyptians only knew Coptic, there would be little point in holding their services in Greek. Jones (1959) 280 asks satirically if the average Copt thought: "I am an Egyptian and proud of it. I hate the Roman oppressor, and will at the earliest opportunity cast off the alien yoke. Meanwhile I insist on speaking my own native Coptic instead of Greek, the language of the foreign government, and I refuse to belong to its Church. I do not know or care whether Christ has one or two natures, but as the Romans insist on the latter view, I hold the former?"

The rejection by the monks and people of Alexandria in 516 of Anastasius' choice of patriarch, the moderate Dioscorus II, and subsequent rioting, have been seen as a meaningless revolt against the rule of Constantinople and thus an episode in favour of the nationalism argument. However, the incident may also be seen merely as an expression of the Alexandrians' wish to guard their canonical rights and resist the interference of a secular power (see Baynes (1926) and Boak (1928) esp. 5-6): or indeed, as is more likely, a far less idealistic cause, the shortage of olive oil, was to blame; cf. Mal. 401-402.

⁹⁶ Anastasius considered it better to allow Egypt to remain in peace, which explains his annoyance against Euphemius for stirring up trouble, and also his ingratitude to a certain John the Tabennesiote. The latter, an ex-patriarch of Alexandria, who had once rescued the emperor from a shipwreck, hoped for assistance in re-establishing his career, but was refused; Theod. Lect. 452, Theoph. AM 5984.

the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria and formed an association with Euphemius.

In Syria and Palestine, doctrinal boundaries were far more blurred. There were three main parties: the Chalcedonians, the fanatical monks of Palestine and Syria II, who wielded great influence in Jerusalem;⁹⁷ the monophysites of north-east Syria and Cappadocia II whose power would extend during the reign of Anastasius, under the leadership of the persuasive and ruthless Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbög (Hierapolis); and lastly, the moderates, represented by such figures as Flavian, the patriarch of Antioch.⁹⁸ Phrygia, and particularly the area immediately around Mabbög, were thriving centres of monophysitism. Isauria, slightly outside the orbit of Philoxenus' direct influence, was far less extreme; for, although the Isaurians would follow Philoxenus against Flavian of Antioch, they did not condemn the Council of Chalcedon.

Macedonius appeared to be the ideal candidate to bring together these disparate elements. Using the *Henoticon* as the basis, he was keen to see relations restored between Constantinople and the monophysite Alexandria, and Constantinople and the Chalcedonian western church. Thus, he accepted a letter of communion from the monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, John II, but at the same time he continued to recognise the Council of Chalcedon and won support from the powerful extreme pro-Chalcedonian Sleepless Monks in the capital. This flexible approach seems to have been relatively successful in restoring ecclesiastical unity, at least among the eastern patriarchates.⁹⁹

The Rise of the Monophysites

Macedonius' success, however, was limited. The more extreme monophysites of the east found a leader in Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbög (Hierapolis). In his youth, Philoxenus had been noticed at the school of Edessa for his violent opposition to Ibas. His career was advanced by Palladius, the monophysite successor of Peter Fuller, but he was expelled from the diocese of Antioch under Calendion for disturbances created by his preaching of the views of Cyril and his vociferous support of the *Henoticon*. He was reinstated when Peter Fuller

⁹⁷ Palestine was generally orthodox, except for the monophysite stronghold of Peter the Iberian; cf. Stein (1949) II.174-176.

⁹⁸ Anastasius deliberately nominated the moderate Flavian in 498, who obediently signed the *Henoticon*. This seemed a useful compromise at the time although, as events proved, Flavian was able to please neither side.

⁹⁹ Cf. Frend (1979) esp. 185ff, Daley (1995) 36-37.

became patriarch again, the latter offering him protection and giving him the bishopric of Mabbög.¹⁰⁰

At the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century, Philoxenus arrived in Constantinople. The date and the purpose of this visit are unclear, complicated by reports of a synod held at his instigation in the capital, the proceedings and date of which are also disputed. Victor of Tunnuna reported two synods as follows: in 497, Macedonius called a synod at which he condemned those who accepted the Council of Chalcedon and those who defended Nestorius and Eutyches;¹⁰¹ and in 499, the emperor, along with Flavian and Philoxenus, called a synod at Constantinople at which they anathematised Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Ibas of Edessa, the bishops Andrew, Eucherius, Quirinus and John, all other dyophysites, those who would not agree to the formula 'one of the Trinity', Leo and his Tome and those who accepted Chalcedon.¹⁰²

It is extremely unlikely, however, that the 499 synod ever took place. It is improbable that Philoxenus and Flavian would jointly have convened a synod or that such a synod would have been held without Macedonius being present. Moreover, in 499, the monophysites under Philoxenus did not yet require the anathematisation of all leading Chalcedonians. In a letter to Maron of Anaxarbus, Philoxenus explained that initially he only demanded the anathematisation of Nestorius, thinking this would be sufficient to secure the condemnation of Chalcedonian doctrine.¹⁰³ The details of the 497 synod reported by Victor of Tunnuna, however, correspond closely with those announced by Theophanes under the year 499: "In this year Macedonius, at the emperor's

instigation, attempted to unite the monasteries of the capital that had seceded because of Zeno's *Henoticon*".¹⁰⁴ Theophanes represents the council as an attempt by Macedonius to rally the monasteries of Dion, Bassianus, the Sleepless Ones and Matrona, all of whom had broken communion with him because of his signing of the *Henoticon*.¹⁰⁵

In turn, this local synod of 499, aimed at calming the situation in the capital's pro-Chalcedonian monasteries, is often confused with a second synod held at Constantinople in 507 which had a very different outcome. Michael the Syrian reports that Philoxenus went to the imperial city on Anastasius' order to assist with a synod at which the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon would be anathematised.¹⁰⁶ The date which Michael assigns to this (prior to the Severan embassy of 508) corresponds with Theophanes' date of 507 for the invitation of Philoxenus by Anastasius.¹⁰⁷ Also under the year 507, Theophanes refers to Anastasius' determination to divert Macedonius from the two natures doctrine. Many bishops, in order to win the emperor's favour, rejected the Chalcedon synod. It is apparent from the *Vita Severi* of Zachariah that Anastasius, after reading before the senate a letter of Philoxenus, tried to compel Macedonius to anathematise Diodore, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Ibas of Edessa, Andrew of Samos, John of Antioch, Euthemius of Tyre, the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. It is clear, therefore, that separate synods were held in 499 and 507, each with very different results.¹⁰⁸ Relations between the emperor and Macedonius had growing increasingly sour in the intervening years and would become more so before the patriarch's deposition. Macedonius adopted a stronger orthodox belief, was prone to bowing to the wishes of the Constantinopolitan monasteries, and, like his predecessor, refused to relinquish the emperor's profession of faith.

The reason for the confusion surrounding the two synods lies in the association of Philoxenus and the reason for his visit to Constantinople. That he was anxious to clear himself of accusations of disloyalty during the Persian war, and to stir up trouble for the moderate Flavian would suit the situation in both 499 and 507. In 499 he might have visited the

¹⁰⁰ For nefarious stories about Philoxenus' youth, see Theod. Lect. 444 and Theoph. AM 5982. It is possible that these rumours are untrue, given that the orthodox Theodore was unlikely to have any sympathy for the monophysite Philoxenus. However, Joshua Stylites (30) also criticises Philoxenus for being present at a heathen festival in Edessa and not intervening. See further, Budge (1894) 17–29, Binns (1994) 9 and especially de Halleux (1963). Frend (1979) 186 notes that since 485 Philoxenus had been working to transform the beliefs of those in the province of Euphratesia from mostly Nestorian to anti-Chalcedonian. He had already visited Constantinople in 482 seeking support for the monophysite cause.

¹⁰¹ *Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus synodo facta condemnat eos qui Chalcedonensis decreta synodi suscipiunt et eos qui Nestorii et Eutychis defendunt.*

¹⁰² *Anastasius imperator Flaviano Antiocheno et Philoxeno Hieropolitano praesulibus, Constantinopolim synodum congregat, et contra Diodorum Tarsensem, Theodorum Mopsuestenum cum scriptis, Theodorum Cyri, Ibas Edessenum, Andrean, Eucherium, Quirum et Joannem episcopos, caeterosque alios qui in Christo duas praedicabant naturas duasque formas, et qui non confitentur unum de Trinitate crucifixum, una cum Leone episcopo Romano et eius tomo, atque Chalcedonensi inferre anathema persuasit.*

¹⁰³ Indeed Abramowski (1965) 65 places the condemnation of the Antiochaeans by Flavian to between 509–511 when the pressure on Flavian had increased; see also Tisserant in DTC (1953) XII.1512–1513.

¹⁰⁴ τοῦτ' αὖ τῷ ἔτει Μακεδόνιος γνώμη τοῦ βασιλέως ἐνῶσαι τὰ μοναστήρια τῆς βασιλίδος ἔσπευδεν ἀποσχιζόντα διὰ τὸ ἐνωτικὸν Ζήνωνος. Theoph. AM 5991 (tr. Mango and Scott).

¹⁰⁵ Cedr. 628, under the eighth year of Anastasius' reign, mentions an attempt of Macedonius to unite the city monks.

¹⁰⁶ Mich. Syr. IX.8; on the 507 synod, see Grillmeier (1987) II.1.270–1.

¹⁰⁷ Theoph. AM 5999.

¹⁰⁸ It is not necessary, as de Halleux (1963) 62–64 does, to try to amalgamate the two synods.

capital to object about the nomination to the patriarchate of Antioch of Flavian,¹⁰⁹ who had reintroduced the names of Nestorius and his supporters on the diptychs. However, a later visit to Constantinople to complain about Flavian's activities would also be perhaps more appropriate. In 505, the synodical letters of John III, which expressed open condemnation of Chalcedon and the Tome, went too far, even for the moderate Flavian, who broke communion with the Alexandrian patriarch.¹¹⁰ If this was the cause of Philoxenus' trip to Constantinople, it fits very well with the 507 dating.¹¹¹

The political implications for the Persian war of the increasing divide between monophysites and Chalcedonians were serious. For the latter, the monophysites made a useful scapegoat for any Roman defeats. In his description of the capture of Amida, a wealthy monastery city, Marcellinus *Comes* implies that it was betrayed by anti-Chalcedonian monks: "In the fifth month after commencing his attack on the very rich city of Amida, Choades, the king of the Persians, broke into it after it had been betrayed with the connivance of its monks, and killed its monastic traitors".¹¹² These suspicions had to be taken seriously, especially since Mabbög, an assembly point for troops undertaking incursions into Persia, and Mardin on the Mesopotamian frontier, were both strongholds of anti-Chalcedonianism.¹¹³

On the other hand, it was imperative that the Christians in the frontier regions should be united and do all they could to help their co-religionists over the border. At the request of Mar Simeon, a Persian Christian, concerning the fate of Christians in the Persian empire, Anastasius wrote to the Persian king: "You will do well if you order that peace shall reign in your empire in your days; and in this matter, you will gratify and please us, if your order keeps the Christian peoples in your empire unmolested, when you order that they shall not harm one another by reason of occasions of enmity, nor any of your people molest them".¹¹⁴ The Persian king complied, but with the outbreak of

¹⁰⁹ Notably by Lebon (1909) 41, Charanis (1974) 58 and Gray (1979) 36.

¹¹⁰ In letters concerning the synod of Sidon, the names of John and Philoxenus are often linked, suggesting that the two worked closely together.

¹¹¹ About 507, Anastasius agreed to a remission of one of the taxes in the metropolis of Euphratesia which had suffered war damage (cf. de Halleux (1963) 63), and brought over a Persian-Syrian painter to decorate the churches of Constantinople, possibly under the influence of Philoxenus: Theod. Lect. 467, Theoph. AM 5999.

¹¹² *Amidam opulentissimam civitatem monachorum eius astu proditam Choadis rex Persarum quinto mense, quam expugnare eam coeperat, inrupit, proditoresque eius monachos obtruncavit.* Marc. C. 502 (tr. Croke).

¹¹³ Frend (1972) 185; Gray (1979) 37.

¹¹⁴ John of Eph. PO 17.143 (tr. Charanis (1974) 58). Charanis and Gray (1979) 37 date this request to 499.

the war in 502 many monophysites were massacred, and the rest fled to Syria, intensifying the religious struggle there. In Persia, the monophysites had represented Roman interests; now in Syria, it was crucial that Anastasius should support them as a bulwark against Persian danger. In his bishopric of Mabbög, for example, Philoxenus had gathered a strong anti-Persian, anti-Chalcedonian element which the emperor dare not alienate.¹¹⁵ However, in the context of the delicate balance of power in that region between the monophysites and the dyophysites, any imperial favour for one side could easily upset the equation. Thus, Anastasius' support of the monophysites seemed to many no political gesture but a definite sign of a change in religious policy, guided by personal belief and the powerful influence of Philoxenus. It therefore seems very likely that Philoxenus' visit to Constantinople in 507 was very much connected to the Persian war. He was prepared to defend his loyalty to the empire and Anastasius was now ready to favour the monophysites in an attempt to ensure peace and security in the troubled east. Governance over a peaceful and united eastern front, especially in the wake of the recent Persian threat, remained Anastasius' priority and long-standing aim, and again he followed the means to that end which must have seemed most pragmatically sensible at this time.

There is no doubt, however, that the monophysite cause was also boosted at this time by the increasing power of the eloquent and persuasive Severus who would later become the patriarch of Antioch and one of the great leaders of the monophysite movement. Like Philoxenus, he too visited Constantinople at the beginning of the sixth century seeking support for the anti-Chalcedonians. A native of Sozopolis in Pisidia, he came from a wealthy land-owning family but with church connections.¹¹⁶ His grandfather, a bishop of Sozopolis, had

¹¹⁵ It is useful to add here a comparison with the Church of Armenia, which was independent and took no part in the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. In the early 500s, it accepted the views of the monophysite Mesopotamians who, with them, were suffering in the Persian war. It affirmed unity with Rome, condemning Nestorius and Eutyches, and approved "the letter of Zeno blessed emperor of the Romans". There was no political hostility towards the Roman Empire. See Jones (1959) 293.

¹¹⁶ On Severus' background, see e.g. Frend (1979) 187. Many details about the activities of Severus can be gleaned from *The Conflict of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch* by Athanasius Scriptor, and from two other *Lives*, by John, the abbot of the monastery of Beith-Aphthonia in Syria (d.536) and by Severus' friend and student colleague, Zachariah Scholasticus, written while Severus was patriarch of Antioch (513–518/519). See also *Hist. Nest.* X, Kugener (1907) and Brooks (1903) v–xi. For a discussion of the identity of this Zachariah with Zachariah Rhetor, the writer of the ecclesiastical history and Zachariah, the bishop of Mytilene who condemned Severus in 536, see Frend (1972) 202–203, Bauer (1967) 210–211, and below, Appendix A, p.268.

been present at the Council of Ephesus at which Nestorius was deposed. Severus was educated in grammar and rhetoric at Alexandria where he also studied the work of Libanius and Basil, and gradually widened his reading to encompass Athanasius, Gregory, John Chrysostom and Cyril. However, with the aim of becoming an advocate, he went next to Beirut (in 486). At first he resisted all persuasion to be baptised, saying: "You will not make a monk of me, for I am a student of law and love law".¹¹⁷ Despite this protestation, he did become more interested in religion, possibly meeting the celebrated Peter of Iberia, and was baptised in 488 in the church of St. Leontius, near Tripolis.¹¹⁸ Although he returned to Sozopolis to practise law, Severus also made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where, falling further under the influence of the disciples of Peter of Iberia, he decided to become a monk. He stayed at the monastery of Romanus in the wilderness near Eleutheropoli,¹¹⁹ before going to Peter's monastery which was located somewhere between Gaza and Maiuma, where he led an ascetic life. Later he founded his own monastery, and during this time he developed the monophysite faith that was to become the basis for the rapid rise of the movement up to 518.¹²⁰ His *Philaethes* reflects a doctrine which was firmly anti-Chalcedonian: "It is obvious that the same being is at once God and man, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and consubstantial with us men according to his humanity".¹²¹ He reiterated this belief in a letter to the bishop Sergius, writing: "When the hypostatic union, which is the perfect union of the two natures, is confessed, there is only one Christ, without mixture, one person, one hypostasis, and one nature, that of the Incarnate Word".¹²² Severus adhered to his beliefs to such an extreme that he judged it wrong even to greet someone who did not share these views.¹²³

It was while Severus was setting up his own monastery that there began a ruthless persecution of Palestinian monks, led by Nephalius. Originally a monophysite, but now a committed supporter of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, it is possible that he was encouraged by Elias, the

patriarch of Jerusalem, who began to note with alarm the growing numbers of extreme monophysites.¹²⁴ In response, Severus went to Constantinople, at the head of a deputation of about two hundred monks, and laid before the emperor his complaints about the activities of Nephalius.¹²⁵ Perhaps surprisingly, he found the emperor sympathetic to his cause. As already seen, Anastasius had inclined more towards supporting the monophysites in Syria and must have been glad to welcome Severus.¹²⁶ He ordered that the monks who had been forced to leave their monasteries should be restored.

The Triumph of the Monophysites, 508–512

Severus and his deputation remained in the imperial capital for three years, during which time the divide between Philoxenus and the moderate Flavian had been growing wider. Over the previous two or three years, Philoxenus had been gradually intensifying his demands on Flavian, first requiring an anathema on all dyophysites, and then indicating specific individuals by name.¹²⁷ Philoxenus stirred up trouble among the monks of Syria I, especially in Antioch, accusing Flavian of Nestorianism. Thus in 508/509, at Anastasius' request, Flavian held a synod at Antioch at which Philoxenus was present, and also Constantine, the monophysite bishop of Seleucia.¹²⁸ Here Flavian subscribed again to the *Henoticon*, condemned the first three oecumenical synods, passed over Chalcedon in silence and denounced Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa and the other opponents of the Twelve Chapters of Cyril. He introduced four chapters giving the impression that he was opposed to the Council of

¹²⁴ See Duchesne (1925) 19f. For the life of Nephalius, see Moeller (1944); and for his change of faith, Lebon (1909) 43–44; on his visit to Constantinople, Frend (1979) 186.

¹²⁵ John of Nikiu LXXXIX.48ff, with Grillmeier (1987) II.1.273.

¹²⁶ See Athanasius' account of the *Conflict of Severus* for two letters: the first to Romulus and John, chief monks at the monastery where Severus was staying; and the second to Severus himself, encouraging Severus to come to the capital to assist Anastasius in his new anti-Chalcedonian policy which was being hampered by Macedonius: "And hasten, therefore, and join us ... beloved Severus, be not anxious or distressed, saying that, when you come to us, we will not harken to you and that we will not reject Bishop Macedonius, the blasphemous heretic; and let not this thought be in your perfect heart." (tr. Goodspeed, *PO* 4.622–623, and Coleman-Norton (1966) 953–954); cf. Gray (1979) 38. The accuracy of this representation of events may be called into question; there is no evidence that at this stage Anastasius had turned against Macedonius or abandoned hope of unity based on the moderate *Henoticon*.

¹²⁷ See Evag. III.31, with Lebon (1909) 42f and Frend (1979) 188.

¹²⁸ Cf. Mansi (1762) VIII.347–348 suggesting that it was Flavian himself (rather than Anastasius) who called the synod; cf. Grillmeier (1987) II.1.271–273 with n.126.

¹¹⁷ Zach., *Vit. Sev.*, *PO* 2.52 (tr. Frend (1972) 205).

¹¹⁸ The account of Zachariah provides an interesting insight into student life at Alexandria and Beirut, and into the heathen practices that were still prevalent at the end of the fifth century.

¹¹⁹ Athanasius, *Vit. Sev.*, *PO* 4.600ff, emphasises the influence of Romanus' monastery, one of the remaining bastions of anti-Chalcedonianism in Palestine.

¹²⁰ For more details on the Christological beliefs of Severus, Frend (1972) 207–214.

¹²¹ *Philaethes* 113 (tr. Frend (1972) 209). For further comments on the *Philaethes*, see e.g. Frend (1979) 187.

¹²² Tr. Frend (1972) 209.

¹²³ Sel. Let. IV:6.

Chalcedon and especially its definition of faith, and yet the monophysites were still not satisfied.¹²⁹ Indeed, they increased their demands to a total rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. Flavian sent a report of the synod and a letter to the emperor.

Anastasius appointed Severus to act as an arbitrator between Philoxenus and Flavian, thus showing how far the emperor had gone in abandoning Macedonius as his 'spiritual adviser' in favour of Severus. In 510 or 511, Severus produced the formula of satisfaction (τύπος τῆς πληροφορίας) and sent it to Flavian to sign.¹³⁰ As for its composition, Severus in a letter to Constantine of Seleucia recounted how John of Claudiopolis had visited him in Constantinople and recommended that a compromise statement should be introduced into the formula of satisfaction: "We receive the synod at Chalcedon, not as a definition of faith, but as a rejection of Nestorius and Eutyches". Despite Severus rejecting this proposal outright ("But, if the formula of satisfaction in so many words rejects the doctrines of the Synod and of the impious Tome of Leo, which are the lifeblood of the abomination of Nestorius, how can we honestly say that we accept this synod as against Nestorius?"¹³¹) it appears that the final version did acknowledge Chalcedon as a disciplinary, if not doctrinal, council. Surviving in two sections, the first appears to accept the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesus and the *Henoticon*, and anathematizes all dyophysites, while the second part contains anathemas against certain individuals, including Nestorius and Eutyches. The Tome of Leo and the Chalcedonian formula 'in two natures' were condemned. Thus, it seems that the *typos* gave a monophysite interpretation of the *Henoticon*, or, put another way, it gave a neo-Chalcedonian view, in agreeing with the anathemas but not with the definition of faith of Chalcedon.¹³² The *typos* corresponded to Severus' speech on becoming patriarch, in which he

¹²⁹ Cf. Grillmeier (1987) II.1.272 quoting Philoxenus' letter to the monks of Palestine.

¹³⁰ The text survives in an Armenian version in "Le Livre des Lettres" and "Le Sceau de la Foi"; for an English translation and discussion, Coleman-Norton (1966) 950–951 and Grillmeier (1987) II.1.275. It is referred to by Evagrius (III.31); see Whitby (2000) 170f, n.106. See also Lebon (1929) and Moeller (1961). For text and translation, see Appendix C.

¹³¹ Sel. Let. I.1 (and tr. Grillmeier (1987) 276–77); cf. Zach. *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.107–108 and Evag. III.31. Severus' hardline views were accepted by other Isaurian bishops; on his attempt to win over Isauria to his beliefs, Frend (1981).

¹³² Cf. Moeller (1961) 245–246, Frend (1981) 210; Lebon (1909) 47–48 and Capizzi (1969) 116–118 also see the *typos* as neo-Chalcedonian, in agreeing the condemnation of Nestorius and Eutyches, but not the definition of faith. Neo-Chalcedonianism was to be defined at a synod of Alexandretta, Cilicia 513–515, and John the Grammarian (Cappadocia) was to be the first known neo-Chalcedonian writer. For further discussion on neo-Chalcedonianism, see Moeller (1951) *passim*.

mentioned the first three oecumenical councils and the *Henoticon*, and anathematized the Chalcedonian definition and the Tome. Flavian still tried to avoid having to sign the *typos*, but produced his own profession of faith very close to it, in which he accepted the Chalcedonian condemnation of Nestorius and Eutyches, but not the definition of faith.

This episode had serious repercussions back in Constantinople and contributed to the worsening relations between the emperor and Macedonius. The news of Flavian's rejection of Chalcedon was received unfavourably in orthodox Constantinople, and Macedonius, whose position up until this point had been similar to that of the moderate Flavian, refused to anathematise by name the Antiochene Fathers as Flavian had agreed at the 508/509 Council. Instead, he anathematized Flavian and expelled his agents.¹³³

In 510, Macedonius refused to communicate with the representatives of John III of Alexandria, unless they accepted the decrees of Chalcedon. To the emperor's demand for Macedonius himself to anathematise the Council of Chalcedon, the patriarch cleverly replied that he could only do so at an oecumenical council presided over by the pope. Macedonius knew that any mention of Rome would infuriate Anastasius and he wanted to make any concession on his part as unacceptable as possible. The ploy was successful. Anastasius did not care to be reminded of the pre-eminence of Rome, nor the view that an emperor could not dictate the policy of the church. In response, he took away the right of asylum from the Great Church, and asylum was only recognised in monophysite churches.¹³⁴ An attempt of the pro-Chalcedonians led by Magna, Anastasius' sister-in-law, was unsuccessful in persuading the emperor to their point of view. They presented him with a book of quotations favourable to the Chalcedonian creed, especially from the writings of Cyril, but Anastasius had the book burnt and its author, Dorotheus, an Egyptian monk, exiled.¹³⁵

At the same time, the monophysites were relentless in their pressure against Macedonius and the Chalcedonians in the capital.¹³⁶ The monks of Severus added to the Trishagion hymn the monophysite addition "who was crucified for us".¹³⁷ This passed without incident in the

¹³³ Theod. Lect. 477, with Miller (1873) 280, Theoph. AM 6002, Grumel (1932) 140–141, Daley (1995) 37, with n.26.

¹³⁴ It was rumoured that Anastasius hired an assassin, Eucolus, to dispose of the uncooperative patriarch, but Macedonius avoided the attack and magnanimously ordered a fixed amount of provisions to be given to the criminal; cf. Smith and Wace (1882) III.777.

¹³⁵ Theod. Lect. 481, with Miller (1872) 278–279, and Theoph. AM 6002.

¹³⁶ For contact between Severus and Macedonius in the capital, and their doctrinal discussions, see Athanasius' *Conflict of Severus*, PO 4.641ff.

¹³⁷ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, Theoph. AM 6003.

church of the Archangel, but when it was introduced in the Great Church on the following Sunday it provoked a violent reaction from the Chalcedonian monks.¹³⁸ There was commotion throughout Constantinople as the orthodox monks, with Palestinian reinforcements, shouted, "Now is the time for martyrdom, Christians: let us not desert the father."¹³⁹ Anastasius, in fear for his life, hastily invited Macedonius to the palace to persuade him to pacify the crowd, and to discuss the fate of the church. After reprimanding the emperor for his recent inclination to monophysitism, Macedonius left, satisfied that Anastasius would return to at least an outward support for Chalcedon.¹⁴⁰ However, once the immediate danger had passed, the emperor had time to consider his counter-attack. Genuinely fearful at the strength of opposition displayed against him, annoyed at the humiliation received at the hands of the patriarch, and angered at being forced into a very public about-turn, he was now keen to re-establish his independence, discredit Macedonius and reassert the cause of the monophysites. Summoning Macedonius to the palace and blaming him for the outbreak of the riot, the emperor accused him of Nestorianism and demanded a profession of faith.¹⁴¹ Macedonius complied in 511, submitting a document in which, according to Theodore Lector, he acknowledged the first two oecumenical councils, reaffirmed his acceptance of the *Henoticon*, and passed over both Ephesus and Chalcedon. However, Evagrius, quoting a letter from the orthodox monks of Palestine to Alcison, bishop of Nicopolis in Epirus, indicates that Macedonius' profession went much further in abandoning his moderate Chalcedonian position by also including anathemas against "Nestorius and Eutyches and those who hold the doctrine of two Sons or Christs or divide the natures".¹⁴²

¹³⁸ The outbreak of violence was so severe that Anastasius was almost forced to flee. For a detailed description of this affair, Duchesne (1925) 22ff, Stein (1949) II.169, Daley (1995) 37; contra Rose (1888) 10–12, who follows John of Nikiu LXXXIX.54–68 and Evagrius III.44, and confuses this disturbance over the Trishagion with a later disturbance in 512.

¹³⁹ καιρός μαρτυρίου, μή καταλείψωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. Theoph. AM 6003 (tr. Mango and Scott).

¹⁴⁰ Theod. Lect. 483–486, Theoph. AM 6003.

¹⁴¹ cf. Evag. III.44, quoting a letter of Severus to Soterichus (an eye-witness, though naturally biased), records that the riots' "initiator and champion ... was Macedonius" (ἡς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ προστάτην γενέσθαι τὸν Μακεδόνην) (tr. Whitby). John of Nikiu LXXXIX.59 also takes this line. On the profession of faith: Stein (1949) II.169ff gives a different account, relating how Celer, the *magister officiorum*, almost tricked Macedonius into making a dubious profession of faith. Lebon (1909) 45 discusses the reasons behind the charge of Nestorianism, concluding that, to monophysites, all dyophysite doctrine was Nestorian.

¹⁴² Νεστόριον καὶ Εὐτυχῆ καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς ἡ Χριστοὺς δογματίζοντας ἡ τὰς φύσεις διαιροῦντας. Evag. III.31 (tr. Whitby).

Whether Macedonius went so far as to explicitly condemn all dyophysites, or whether it was merely the omission of Chalcedon,¹⁴³ he later recalled this profession in response to the outrage of the orthodox monks. At the monastery of either Matrona or Dalmatius, he declared his acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon and affirmed that he held as heretics all those who refused to receive him. Communion with the monks was restored. At this desertion, Anastasius launched against the vacillating patriarch his final challenge, demanding from him the original records of the Council of Chalcedon. Macedonius refused, placing them for safety under the altar of the Great Church, from where, however, they were secretly removed by the steward, Calopodius, and handed to Anastasius who destroyed them.¹⁴⁴

Alongside the reports of Macedonius' profession by Theodore Lector and Evagrius, John of Beith-Aphthonia recounts that Severus directed Celer to ask Macedonius "whether he confessed as one individual the hypostasis of the Holy Trinity who had become human, without change, and had been born of Mary".¹⁴⁵ Macedonius refused to make such a confession, reportedly saying that he would not do so even if his tongue should be cut out. In his biography of Severus, Zachariah describes a debate on doctrinal issues between Macedonius and Severus held in the first months of 511,¹⁴⁶ which doubtless led to the gathering on 20th July at which Macedonius was compelled to publicly renounce Chalcedon and which would ultimately lead to his exile.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ Theod. Lect. 487; contra Evag. III.31 and Mich. Syr. IX.9. Of the two accounts, it is probable that that of Theodore Lector is more biased; a Chalcedonian himself, he is generally hostile to Anastasius. He would be loathe to record any weakening on the part of Macedonius, while if Macedonius could be shown to be merely following the line of the *Henoticon*, then it would make Anastasius' subsequent action in deposing him all the more unreasonable. Evagrius, on the other hand, although orthodox himself, does not seek to show the monophysite emperor in a negative light, and more crucially, he is quoting external primary evidence. There is also a case to be made for attributing responsibility to Macedonius for neither version: they were merely circulated under his name (Lebon (1909) 46, contra Grumel (1932) 141, who thinks that Lebon rejects too easily Evagrius' evidence of the letter of the Palestinian monks); but there seems no good reason to reject the evidence of both Theodore Lector and Evagrius.

¹⁴⁴ Marc. C. 511, Theod. Lect. 491, Theoph. AM 6004; contra James of Edessa, *Chron.* 179, *Chronicon Edessenicum* LXXXIII and Mich. Syr. IX.9 who give an alternative version, that the records of Chalcedon were hidden in the coffin of Euphemia the martyr, and Anastasius ordered the coffin to be opened and the records burned. For an alternative version suggesting that the work demanded from Macedonius was a florilegium of Diodore, Theodore of Mopsuestia and the five books of Theodoret against Cyril, see Grillmeier (1987) II.1.279, n.158.

¹⁴⁵ Daley (1995) 38; John, *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.3:236–237, with Frend (1979) 191.

¹⁴⁶ On the problems debated, see e.g. Frend (1979) 189ff.

¹⁴⁷ Zach., *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.109; cf. Frend (1979) 192, Grillmeier (1987) 2.1:278, Daley (1995) 38.

There are several accounts of his downfall, the most detailed of which may be found in a letter of the Syrian presbyter, Simeon of Amida, to the monophysite archimandrite Samuel, reproduced in Zachariah of Mytilene's ecclesiastical history.¹⁴⁸

Despite his outright condemnation of Chalcedon, when Macedonius found that neither Anastasius nor the Chalcedonian Ariadne attended his celebration of the liturgy two days later on 22nd July, he prudently withdrew to the monastery of Dalmatius. According to Theophanes, "he defended himself in an address to the zealous monks and clergy, who were shocked at his actions, stating that he accepted the Synod of Chalcedon and held those who did not accept it as heretics".¹⁴⁹ Anastasius reacted angrily, writing to the patrician Clementius: "Do you not see what this Jew is doing to us? Having denounced before myself and before your grace the synod (Chalcedon) and the term *prosopa* (as applicable to Christ), he has gone without any need to the monastery and there spoken things contrary to the truth and lied to God, even before me and you. Is this good?"¹⁵⁰ Meanwhile, the emperor continued to gather support for Macedonius' dismissal, convening a council on 27th July at which Clementius delivered his reply: "He who has lied to God, God himself will reject from his priesthood";¹⁵¹ and on 29th July, Anastasius assembled the military officers. Perhaps encouraged by the handout of five denarii each, they swore the following oath:

By this law of God [the Gospels] and by the words which are written in it, we will contend with all our might for the true faith and for the kingdom and we will not act treacherously either against the truth or the king.¹⁵²

The next day, largesse was distributed to the whole army. At this point, some of Macedonius' clergy began to turn away from him, and on 31st July, Anastasius ordered the clergy to formally break communion with their patriarch. The orthodox monks who might be expected to cause

trouble were kept out of the city.¹⁵³ On 1st August, the monk Pascasius, who had led the orthodox riot after the monophysite addition to the Trishagion, was arrested and revealed that Macedonius was planning a rebellion. Several church documents were confiscated, including Anastasius' profession of faith which he had originally signed at his accession for Euphemius, and in which he had undertaken to make no innovations in church policy. At a local synod held on 6th August, Macedonius was deposed¹⁵⁴ and on the following day he and his clergy were arrested by Celer as they sought sanctuary in the Great Church. The patriarch was deported to Euchaita¹⁵⁵ and the remainder of his supporters either fled or were arrested.

Anastasius was heavily criticised for his treatment of Macedonius. Again an emperor had interfered in church matters, and his treatment of the patriarch was viewed as heavy-handed. From a doctrinal point of view, Anastasius was seen to be no longer pursuing a policy based on the *Henoticon*, but to have come under the influence of Severus and Philoxenus who were both extreme in their monophysite views. However, it was apparent that Macedonius, too, was no longer advocating a moderate course, but was becoming closer to the extreme pro-Chalcedonian monks of the capital. Meanwhile, there was no change in the situation of the eastern provinces: monophysitism was still dominant in most parts, and Anastasius was no doubt hopeful that once Flavian had been persuaded to take a more monophysite line, Macedonius, who had previously been in communion with the Antiochene patriarch, would have followed suit. That he chose to ally himself with the pro-Chalcedonian monks disappointed Anastasius who could not have an outspoken Chalcedonian patriarch in Constantinople when official imperial policy remained the *Henoticon* and so he took steps to have him deposed. In spite of this ruthlessness in despatching a second

¹⁴⁸ Simeon's letter records Anastasius stating at this point: "Whoever sets out to make common cause with Macedonius, or has communion with him, is opposed to my majesty." (tr. Daley (1995) 39, n.37).

¹⁴⁹ He was accused of falsifying Scripture; cf. Liberatus, *Brev.* XIX, with Frend (1972) 218 and Frend (1979) 192. Anastasius also accused him of being a Manichee and a Eutychian; cf. Agapius of Manbidj *PO* 8.423, Zach. of Myt. VII.8. Even before the synod, Macedonius had been accused of many crimes, including pederasty; Theod. Lect. 490, Theoph. AM 6004.

¹⁵⁰ On 6th August; see Theod. Lect. 492, contra Evag. III.32 who says that Celer, a Chalcedonian, secretly advised Macedonius to withdraw. It is possible to reconcile these two accounts: Celer firstly advised Macedonius to leave, but when the patriarch paid no heed, was forced to remove him on the emperor's orders. Perhaps ironically, Macedonius was sent to Euchaita, where his deposed predecessor had also been exiled. According to Landolfus *Sagax* XVII.215, Anastasius' brother, Pompeius, and his wife, provided for Macedonius in his banishment.

¹⁴⁸ See the letter of Simeon the presbyter, a monk at Constantinople, to Samuel, an archimandrite in Syria, which contains a very detailed account of the deposition of Macedonius; Zach. of Myt. VII.8; with Daley (1995) 39ff; for other accounts, see e.g. Evag. III.32 who saw Macedonius' refusal to relinquish Anastasius' profession of faith as a major cause of the rupture; Marc. C. 511 who saw his refusal to hand over the acta of the Council of Chalcedon as the principal cause; contra other sources who place more weight on the doctrinal differences between him and Severus.

¹⁴⁹ τοῖς κληρικοῖς καὶ μοναχοῖς ζηλωταῖς σκανδαλισθεῖσιν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπελογήσατο διὰ προσφωνητικοῦ λόγου, ὅτι δέχεται τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον καὶ τοὺς μὴ δεχομένους αὐτὴν αἰρετικούς ἔχει, καὶ συνελευτούργησαν αὐτῷ. Theoph. AM 6004 (tr. Mango and Scott).

¹⁵⁰ Zach. of Myt. VII.8 (tr. Frend (1979) 191).

¹⁵¹ Frend (1979) 191.

¹⁵² Charanis (1974) 70.

patriarch of the imperial city, Anastasius now returned to a more balanced and reasonable strategy. He appointed Timothy, presbyter and keeper of the sacred treasures of the Great Church, as Macedonius' successor, rather than Severus, who now left Constantinople.

According to many sources, Timothy did not have the same high moral reputation enjoyed by his predecessor,¹⁵⁶ and he proved to be even more indecisive on which course to follow.¹⁵⁷ Anastasius' relatives, and the powerful Anicia Juliana, refused communion from him.¹⁵⁸ Despite this bad press, Timothy appears, especially at first, to be rather moderate. It is true that he resumed relations with the centre of monophysitism, Alexandria, placing John III in the diptychs. However, in his synodical letter to John, he did not anathematise the Tome of Leo nor the Council of Chalcedon, and consequently John refused to accept the letter.¹⁵⁹ Flavian and Elias, on the other hand, while accepting Timothy's succession, refused to condone the illegal deposition of Macedonius.¹⁶⁰ To counter the emperor's undoubted displeasure, Elias sent a deputation of monks, led by St. Sabas.¹⁶¹ Anastasius, perhaps unexpectedly, welcomed the monks no less than he had done Severus and his deputation. The emperor and the saint met several times and not only was the latter able to gain respite for Elias, but Anastasius also granted Sabas one thousand pounds of gold and promised a tax relief.¹⁶² St. Sabas found warm support from the Chalcedonian relatives of the emperor; and Ariadne, Anastasia, and also Anicia Juliana all visited Sabas and paid homage.¹⁶³

In Syria, however, the extreme monophysites continued to agitate against Flavian. In 511/512, a synod was convened at Sidon concerning which the sources give two contradictory accounts.¹⁶⁴ Two scenarios

are suggested: firstly, that Philoxenus instigated the gathering, called in the first instance by Anastasius to oppose the acts of the Council of Chalcedon;¹⁶⁵ secondly, evidence in the *Vita Severi* of Zachariah¹⁶⁶ and a letter from Philoxenus himself to the abbot Simeon at Teleda indicate that the synod was convened by Flavian to revive the *Henoticon*, and that on this occasion, the monophysites were in the minority. Philoxenus recounted in the letter to Simeon how he had been summoned to Sidon by letter, and subsequently escorted there by a prefect.¹⁶⁷ At the synod, it was clear that Flavian enjoyed the support of most eastern bishops, and also that of Elias.¹⁶⁸ Though Philoxenus was able to rally the support of fellow monophysites en route, and had the invaluable help of Soterichus, bishop of Caesarea (Cappadocia), there were still only ten monophysite bishops at the synod.¹⁶⁹ The emperor was represented by his tribune, Eutropius.

The small number of bishops loyal to Philoxenus present at the synod no doubt accounted for the setback of the monophysites on this occasion. As ever, they had been seeking to have the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon publicly anathematised, and to this end Philoxenus produced a petition, organised by Cosmas of Qinneshrin, which amounted to "seventy-seven chapters, with many quotations from the holy doctors, confirming the censure upon the Council of Chalcedon and Tome of Leo".¹⁷⁰ In response, Flavian and his supporters produced letters to various bishops written by the monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria, including Peter Mongus, Athanasius II and John II, of a mild and conciliatory nature, adhering to the spirit of the *Henoticon*.

It may be that to this occasion belongs a fragmentary text found in a manuscript of orthodox Christological texts now in Venice, purporting to be an oracle from Apollo discovered at Delphi on 18th August,

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Miller (1872) 280–282.

¹⁵⁷ E.g. an abbot from the Studios monastery refused to be ordained by a non-Chalcedonian, so Timothy immediately anathematised all who were opposed to Chalcedon. When the emperor heard this, Timothy immediately denied the report and anathematised all Chalcedonians; cf. Smith and Wace (1887) IV.1034.

¹⁵⁸ Theod. Lect. 504, Landolfus Sagax XVII.215.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Grumel (1932) 144. Anastasius sent a letter to John "which contained no small complaints on the ground that he had not been contented with the *Henoticon* only without requiring reference to be made in actual words to the impious things done at Chalcedon or to the impious Tome of Leo". Sel. Let. IV.2 and tr. Charanis (1974) 72.

¹⁶⁰ Grumel (1932) 144–145.

¹⁶¹ Cyril of Scyth. *Vit. Sab.* L–LIV, Niceph. Cal. XVI.32.

¹⁶² Cf. Binns (1994) 86–87, 174ff. The tax relief was, however, later rescinded by the praetorian prefect, Marinus.

¹⁶³ Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LIII.

¹⁶⁴ The dating is also disputed: Marc. C. gives 512 (followed by Lebon (1909) 51), contra Theoph. AM 6003 (ie. 510–511, followed by Duchesne (1925) 27–28 and Charanis (1974) 73 and Mango (1997) 235). There is little to recommend one date over the other.

The earlier dating of Theophanes allows more time for Philoxenus and his monophysites to step up their campaign against Flavian, culminating in his downfall in the following year. On the other hand, the testimony of the contemporary Marcellinus would normally be preferable to that of Theophanes. For discussion on the Council, see Grillmeier (1987) II.1.279–281.

¹⁶⁵ For this version, see Marc. C. 512, Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVI, Zach. of Myt. VII.10, Theoph. AM 6003, Mich. Syr. IX.8, followed by Mansi (1762) VIII.370–374 and Duchesne (1925) 27–28; cf. Frend (1972) 219.

¹⁶⁶ Zach., *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.111; cf. Charanis (1974) 73–4.

¹⁶⁷ For discussion and references, see Lebon (1909) 52, n.1.

¹⁶⁸ For Elias' role, see Janin (1963a) 189–190.

¹⁶⁹ Marc. C. 512 claims the monophysite bishops numbered eighty, but this figure seems too large, considering the monophysite defeat.

¹⁷⁰ Zach. of Myt. VII.10 and Mich. Syr. IX.10 (tr. Charanis (1974) 74).

511.¹⁷¹ The exact date and place of composition are unknown, however. Although it is thought that the oracle was composed in the capital, the possibility that it was widely known and circulated in Syria is very plausible, and whether it was written in the weeks following Macedonius' downfall, or specifically in answer to Cosmas' seventy-seven chapters, the sentiments expressed were particularly fitting for the Sidon Council. While the oracle begins with the announcement that this is the last consultation of the pagan god, the second part forms a lecture following Chalcedonian doctrine:

The one who suffers is God, yet the godhead itself does not suffer;
For he was both mortal and immortal at once,
Incapable of dying yet capable of it, God's Word and human flesh;
Yet neither was changed, nor did they come to be separated
Or exist apart from each other...¹⁷²

It ends with a specifically Chalcedonian expression of doctrine and with an appeal for unity:

Therefore tremble, tremble, I beg you, and putting an end to discord,
become one with us, just as the Lord himself, who became human,
asks of his Father, saying: 'Holy Father, keep them in your name,
which you gave to me, so that they may be one as we are one.' [John
17.11]¹⁷³

The monophysites, unprepared and outnumbered, had no ammunition against this attack. As Severus wrote, "these letters ... produced in the city of Sidonius, when the synod of bishops was assembled there ... cast great shame upon us who were combating on behalf of the orthodoxy, and nothing else was left to us except only to hide ourselves and yield to manifest refutations".¹⁷⁴ The Synod of Sidon was dissolved, though whether by the triumphant Flavian and Elias, or by Anastasius through Eutropius, it is not clear.¹⁷⁵ As a mark of goodwill, Flavian and Elias wrote to Anastasius confirming their allegiance to the *Henoticon*.

The monophysites, however, did not "hide" themselves for long. Philoxenus and his disciples appealed to Anastasius, while Flavian sent another profession of faith to the emperor, in which he accepted the first three oecumenical councils and the *Henoticon*, and passed over

Chalcedon.¹⁷⁶ The embattled patriarch, able to satisfy neither the Chalcedonians nor the monophysites, and accused of being a Nestorian,¹⁷⁷ immediately embraced the monophysite cause, thus cutting himself off from the dyophysites. But it was too late. The monophysite leaders had already started to close the net around their prey, and "charged him for anathematising the synod with his mouth only and not with his heart".¹⁷⁸ Philoxenus and his monophysite monks instigated a riot in Antioch, and forced Flavian into exile at Petra.¹⁷⁹ On 6th November, 512, Severus became patriarch of Antioch and was consecrated at a Synod of Antioch in 513, orchestrated by Philoxenus. The ceremony was performed by Philoxenus himself, the bishop of Tarsus and ten others.¹⁸⁰ No doubt Philoxenus was heartily relieved at the eventual banishment of his long-standing foe, as he wrote to the monks at the monastery of Sēnûn: "What things I suffered from Flavian and Macedonius, who were archbishops in Antioch and Constantinople, and before them from Calendion, are known and spoken of in every place. But I keep silence concerning the things which were prepared to injure me ... through ... Flavian the heretic ... And when I went up to Constantinople on two occasions the like things were done unto me by the Nestorian heretics".¹⁸¹

Severus' ordination speech included an acceptance of the first three oecumenical councils, a condemnation of all heretics, especially Nestorius and Eutyches, an anathematisation of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, and a denouncement of all who believed in the doctrine of two natures. The *Henoticon* was maintained but interpreted in a completely monophysite way. He announced triumphantly: "We have as associates the venerable bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, and those whom we do not have as such are strangers to our communion".¹⁸² The synodical letter was received with particular joy at

¹⁷⁶ Evag. III.31. There is some suspicion that at the same time Elias sent a letter in which he condemned the Chalcedon Council. The letter from the monks of Palestine to Alcison, quoted by Evagrius, mentions a written statement sent by Elias to Anastasius which contained an anathema on all dyophysites. Later Elias insisted this statement was a forgery, and immediately issued another; cf. Duchesne (1925) 29, Charanis (1974) 75.

¹⁷⁷ John of Nikiu LXXXIX.69.

¹⁷⁸ ἐπέθεντο δὲ κατηγοροῦντες αὐτὸν ὅτι στόματι μόνον τὴν τὴν σύνοδον ἀνεθεμάτισεν, καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ. Theoph. AM 6004 (tr. Mango and Scott).

¹⁷⁹ The violence escalated with the arrival of Flavian's monks; cf. Evag. III.32, Zach. of Myt. VII.10, Niceph. Cal. XVI. 27. Flavian's banishment was officially agreed at the Synod of Laodicaea (512); cf. Gray (1979) 37–38. Significantly, Petra had been the place of Nestorius' exile in 436.

¹⁸⁰ The *chronicon ad 846* p.168 gives a complete list of the bishops at Severus' ordination.

¹⁸¹ Budge (1894) 27–28.

¹⁸² Kugener (1907) 2.322ff (tr. Charanis (1974) 77).

¹⁷¹ On this text and references, see Daley (1995) 41–49.

¹⁷² Lines 43–47 (tr. Daley (1995) 43).

¹⁷³ Lines 126–131 (tr. Daley (1995) 47).

¹⁷⁴ Sel. Let. IV.2 (tr. Charanis (1974) 75). On Severus' relations with Alexandria more generally, see Lebon (1909) 53–54.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Lebon (1909) 54.

the monophysite centre of Alexandria: "John the patriarch and his bishops accepted this letter ... and read it in their churches throughout the land of Egypt; and they offered prayers and thanked the Lord Christ, who had restored the divided members to their places. And with great joy and spiritual exultation did John ... write to the Great Severus an answer to his letter ... full of the orthodox faith".¹⁸³ Yet still in opposition stood Elias of Jerusalem, Julian of Bostra, Epiphanius of Tyre and many others who refused to recognise Severus.¹⁸⁴

The Trishagion, 512, and Riots in Constantinople

At the time of the election of Severus, events in Constantinople were reaching a climax. On 4th November, 512, Anastasius issued an edict, which ordered all churches to add to the Trishagion the monophysite clause, "who was crucified for us".¹⁸⁵ This initiative had met with staunch orthodox opposition in 510 so it is significant that the emperor should have chosen this time to re-introduce the controversial formula at a time when he might otherwise have been seeking to make amends after his treatment of Macedonius. As the date is close to that of the ordination of Severus, it was surely an indication of his support for the new patriarch.¹⁸⁶

The monophysite addition caused much commotion in the Great Church, where, as the choir sang according to imperial orders, the crowd chanted the orthodox version. Blows were exchanged, and many were killed or imprisoned. Again there were disturbances, on Monday 5th November at the church of St. Theodore. On the following day, tension heightened as the crowd gathered in the forum of Constantine to commemorate the anniversary of 472, and an orthodox camp swiftly formed.¹⁸⁷ Marcellinus *Comes* described the scene thus: "Indeed, while

the rest of them day and night sang the hymn of the Trinity to Christ their God, some of the people traversed the whole city and killed by fire and sword the supporters of Anastasius Caesar who were dressed in monastic garb. Others brought the keys of all the gates and the military standards to the forum where they had measured out a religious camp and there, while Anastasius was passing in procession, they shouted for Areobindus to be made emperor".¹⁸⁸ The rioters also dragged statues of the emperor through the streets and stoned Celer and Patricius who were sent to appease them. Marcellinus mentions that the houses of Plato and Marinus were burnt, but omits the tale of the monk found in Marinus' house who was beheaded as the crowd shouted: "This indeed is the conspirator against the Trinity".¹⁸⁹

Anastasius, desperate to calm the crowd, went to the hippodrome without his diadem and offered to resign, reminding the rebels that they could not all be emperor.¹⁹⁰ There are various stories as to how Anastasius convinced the mob. Marcellinus *Comes* recorded: "But Anastasius Caesar, with his usual lies and empty words, promised that he would do everything and sent them back to their homes without any result on the third day after they had entered the forum".¹⁹¹ Eventually, the crowds seemed satisfied that they had forced Anastasius into proffering a public resignation, and realised that there was no viable alternative.

The Orthodox Backlash

In Antioch, the new patriarch was initially received enthusiastically, with the crowds shouting: "Anathematise the council of Chalcedon, ... anathematise the apostate council ... Cursed be the council. Cursed be the Tome of Leo. Deliver the city from heresy ...".¹⁹² A group of monks, expelled from a monastery near Apamea by Flavian, appeared at Severus' monastery at Maiuma, carrying crosses and hailing him

¹⁸³ *Hist. of Alex. Patriarchs*, PO 1.448 (tr. Charanis (1974) 77).

¹⁸⁴ E.g. Peter of Damascus and Marinus of Beirut. Epiphanius of Tyre was Flavian's brother. See Honigsmann (1951) 76–77 on Julian, 38–41 on Epiphanius, 97 on Peter, and 32–33 on Marinus. It was reported by some that Severus' ordination speech was drowned by jeers; cf. Gray (1979) 41 and Grillmeier (1987) II.1.281–282.

¹⁸⁵ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς. See Charanis (1974) 78 with n.165 for the sources. The edict was read by Plato, the city prefect and Marinus, the *praetorian prefect*.

¹⁸⁶ See Charanis (1974) 78 further on this view; cf. Gray (1979) 40 who suggests that Anastasius' success in deposing Macedonius gave him a false sense of having won over the capital.

¹⁸⁷ The anniversary commemorated the natural disasters of 6th November, 472, when the skies of Constantinople were blackened with ash from Vesuvius and Asia Minor suffered a series of damaging earthquakes.

¹⁸⁸ *quorum alii quidem, ceteris die noctuque hymnum trinitatis Christo deo psallentibus, totam peragrant civitatem et Anastasii Caesaris monastico habitu adsectatores ferro flammisque interimunt: alii claves portarum omniumque signa militaria ad forum quo religionis castra metati fuerant, deferunt ibique Anastasio Caesare in processibus degente Areohindam sibi imperatorem fieri clamitant.* Marc. C. 512 (tr. Croke).

¹⁸⁹ αὐτὸς ἄρα τῆς τριάδος ἐπιβουλὸς εἶη. Evag. III.44 (tr. Whitby); cf. Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 818, Cedr. 631, contra John of Nikiu LXXXIX.64, who believed that the crowd thought the monk was Severus. Zon. XIV.3.37 adds that a nun was also beheaded.

¹⁹⁰ Evag. III.44, Mal. 408, *Chron. Pasch.* 517.

¹⁹¹ *hos cives idem Anastasius Caesar solitis periuriis simulatisque vocibus, sese facturum cuncta promittens, tertio die quam in forum advenierant sine ullo rerum effectu ad sua fecit habitacula repedare.* Marc. C. 512. (tr. Croke).

¹⁹² John, *Vit. Sev.*, PO 2.241, Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 823 (tr. Frend (1972) 221).

patriarch. Yet increasingly throughout his patriarchate Severus encountered more and more opposition.¹⁹³ The explanation for this can be found in the possibility that many of the clergy and monks were fairly moderate in whichever view they adhered to, hence the support at Sidon for the moderate Flavian. Severus would accept the *Henoticon* in an anti-Chalcedonian sense, yet believed it to be "superfluous" and problematic.¹⁹⁴ In early 513, the synod at Antioch offered a basis for unity based on acceptance of the *Henoticon* and the denunciation of the Tome and the Council of Chalcedon, but the offer was rejected by many.¹⁹⁵

In Cilicia, the neo-Chalcedonian movement, led by John the Grammarian, inevitably won supporters away from the strict monophysite cause; but in certain areas it was also Severus' extremism which brought about problems. Constantine, the bishop of Isauria, was succeeded on his death by Solon, an ally of Severus, but he was unable to control the rival factions of Isaurian bishops who quarrelled among themselves. However, Severus' dictum that churches should remove from their diptychs the names of all previous Chalcedonian bishops caused outrage and his allies, the bishops Musonius and Callistus, were themselves brought down in their attempt to enforce the ruling.¹⁹⁶ Further south, Severus also failed to sway certain Arab tribes on the Syrian frontier.¹⁹⁷ In desperation, he twice sent synodical letters to Elias, the second time accompanied by imperial soldiers. In response, the monks, led by St. Sabas, pronounced an anathema against Severus and those in communion with him.¹⁹⁸ Julian of Bostra and Peter of Damascus resigned while two other bishops, Cosmas of Epiphanius and Severianus of Arethusa, anathematised Severus. The emperor directed Asiaticus, the commander in Phoenicia Libanensis, to eject Cosmas and Severianus from their sees, but since they enjoyed extensive support, they were eventually left alone.¹⁹⁹ Peter of Apamea, alone of his province, attended the Synod of Antioch; the rest of his clergy broke communion with him and Severus. The remaining Isaurian bishops, except Sergius of Philadelphia and Asterius of Calenderis, also

¹⁹³ Devreese (1945) 70f, Gray (1979) 41.

¹⁹⁴ Sel. Let. I:3, with Frend (1972) 223.

¹⁹⁵ For further details of this synod, see Grillmeier (1987) II.1.282–284. Severus acknowledged that he had suffered many attacks after his ordination speech and indicated that Anastasius had expressed his displeasure that Severus had not strictly adhered to the *Henoticon*.

¹⁹⁶ For a detailed analysis of the situation in Isauria, see Frend (1981).

¹⁹⁷ Theod. Lect. 513, Theoph. AM 6005; cf. ch. 3, pp.39–40.

¹⁹⁸ Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVI.

¹⁹⁹ Evag. III.34, with Allen (1981) 153–154 and Greatrex (1996) 134.

condemned Severus. Other non-Isaurian bishops, however, were either persuaded to accept Severus, or were driven from their bishoprics.

As opposition continued, Philoxenus appealed to the emperor who decided, whether on his own initiative or at the inducement of the monophysites, to call a synod of the eastern bishops "for the purpose of effecting needed reforms".²⁰⁰ As a result, bishops of the provinces of Syria I and II, Euphratesia, Mesopotamia, Arabia and Phoenicia Libanensis convened at Tyre, sometime between 1st October, 514 and 30th September, 515.²⁰¹ Severus led the proceedings and a doctrinal faith based on the *Henoticon* interpreted in an entirely anti-Chalcedonian way, was established. Synodical letters sent to Timothy, John III of Alexandria and Elias were all approved.²⁰²

This is the account given by Zachariah in his *Ecclesiastical History*, but several points seem unlikely.²⁰³ It is improbable that such a synod would be held at Anastasius' instigation or that the synodical letters would have been approved by Timothy, at a time when the capital was threatened by the troops of Vitalian demanding a more orthodox approach.²⁰⁴ There is also some doubt as to whether Elias would have agreed to such a decision, although it has been suggested that the embattled patriarch agreed as a measure of security.²⁰⁵

In his book on Philoxenus de Halleux argues that the Tyre synod did not exist at all, or if it did, it was in a far more low-key form.²⁰⁶ He suggests that the evidence concerning the purpose and events of the Synods of Antioch and Tyre is so similar that it must refer to the same occasion. Secondly, he argues that it would be unlikely that a council promoting monophysitism would be held at Tyre, a stronghold of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. He thus reconstructs the events as follows. The Synod of Antioch was held, probably in 513, on the order of Anastasius at the demand of the monophysites. It had a three-fold purpose:

²⁰⁰ Charanis (1974) 99; Zach. of Myt. VII.12, Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 826 and *Chronicon ad 846* p.168.

²⁰¹ Charanis (1974) 99 is surely right to accept the timing of late 514 or early 515. If it were any later, it would clash with the Synod of Heraclea, which was scheduled for the summer of 515. An earlier date would place it too close to the 513 Synod of Antioch and there must be a sufficient interval from the beginning of Severus' patriarchate for the opportunity for relations to worsen.

²⁰² Grumel (1932) 146.

²⁰³ Zach. of Myt. VII.12, with Frend (1972) 227.

²⁰⁴ Although Gray (1979) 41 suggests that the synod may have been a more subtle attempt by the emperor to reconcile the Chalcedonians (Timothy and Elias in particular) to Severus.

²⁰⁵ Charanis (1974) 99; see Grumel (1932) 147 for the re-sending of the synodical letter to Elias; Gray (1979) 42.

²⁰⁶ De Halleux (1963) 79ff; cf. Grillmeier (1987) II.1.284ff.

firstly, to establish firmly the election of Severus; secondly, to condemn Chalcedon and the Tome; and thirdly, to promote peace in the church. This scenario would allow for a small scale synod to be held later at Tyre to confirm the deposition of Epiphanius and to install a replacement, but that for some reason, the common Syriac source had confused this with the much greater monophysite Synod of 513 at Antioch.

However, it is possible to reconstruct an alternative version which involves both councils and allows the Syriac source to stand. An initial council was needed in 513 soon after Severus' accession to confirm his ordination and the deposition of Flavian; and to reaffirm the *Henoticon* and also the rejection of the Tome and the Council of Chalcedon. It is to this council that the letter of Philoxenus to Simeon of Teleida refers.²⁰⁷ The Synod of Tyre was required to stem the growing tide of opposition against Severus and went even further in its monophysite interpretation of the *Henoticon*. As for the location, this should be seen as a positive argument for the synod, not negative. For how better to crush the orthodox than in their own territory, the bishopric of Epiphanius who was the orthodox brother of Flavian? It seems clear that there is ample reason to admit the existence of two important synods.

The Synod at Tyre, however, was unsuccessful for Severus, as opposition towards him continued.²⁰⁸ He made further efforts to harness support, attempting, in the spring of 515, to detach the bishops of Syria II from the influence of the Chalcedon archimandrites. At a local synod in Antioch, he tried to depose the bishops of Epiphania, Arethusa and Rhaphania.²⁰⁹ They were supported, however, perhaps surprisingly, by the emperor who asked that this decision be rescinded and defended, at least to some extent, the Council of Chalcedon.²¹⁰ This seems rather a change of policy from one who had come to adopt a monophysite interpretation of the *Henoticon*, but Anastasius was perhaps concerned with negotiations with Rome forced on him by the actions of Vitalian.²¹¹

However, that he had not abandoned hope of achieving unity, at least within the east, is clear from his support of Severus' actions against Elias, whose position he had previously upheld. For if he could secure the acquiescence of Jerusalem, all four patriarchates of the east

²⁰⁷ Cf. Lebon (1909) 57ff.

²⁰⁸ Dyophysites, such as John of Scythopolis and John the Grammarian, now began to compose apologies for the Council of Chalcedon. In 515, the monks of Palestine wrote to Alcison about the ecclesiastic situation of Palestine and Syria; Evag. III.31.

²⁰⁹ When they refused to go, they were ejected forcibly; cf. Evag. III.34, Sel. Let. I:21; Charanis (1974) 100.

²¹⁰ Sel. Let. I:24; cf. Charanis (1974) 100 and Gray (1979) 41.

²¹¹ Cf. below, pp. 169–175.

would be in communion. Hopes for an agreement with Rome prevented Anastasius from deposing Elias, but after the defeat of Vitalian at the end of July, 516 the situation changed. He therefore instructed Olympius, the governor of Palestine, to procure Elias' recognition of Severus or depose him. This time Elias' monks could not save him and he was exiled to Aila.²¹²

In his place, John, the 'guarder of the cross' and son of Marcian, bishop of Sebasta, was proposed as the new patriarch, with the promise that he would recognise Severus. On being persuaded by the monks not to do so, he was imprisoned,²¹³ but hastily changed his mind and assured the *dux*, Anastasius, that he would declare his loyalty to Severus in the convent of St. Stephen. About ten thousand monks gathered for the occasion. John, flanked by the monks Theodosius and Sabas, mounted the platform and in response to shouts to anathematise the heretics and confirm the council, the three of them anathematised Nestorius, Eutyches, Severus, Soterichus of Caesarea and all those who did not accept the definition of Chalcedon.²¹⁴ Hypatius, Anastasius' nephew, who was visiting Jerusalem as a pilgrim, hastily swore that he supported communion with the church of Jerusalem and gave Theodosius and Sabas one hundred pounds of gold each for their desert monasteries.²¹⁵ The two monks asked the emperor for peace in Jerusalem and denounced Severus.²¹⁶ Anastasius agreed, asking the monks to pray for peace, and allowed John to continue in his patriarchate unmolested.

Even with the departure of Elias, Severus could not be satisfied. In 517, a rift grew between him and the new patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscorus II, who was less insistent on an outright condemnation of the Tome and Chalcedon, and more content with acceptance of the *Henoticon*. In April, 518, Severus was to complain that the monophysite

²¹² Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVI, Marc. C. 516. If it is true that Elias had accepted the acts of the Synod of Tyre, then his position must have been seriously weakened. Others say that Olympius produced the letter agreeing to an anathematisation of Chalcedon, claimed as a forgery by Elias. For discussion of Cyril of Scythopolis' view that Anastasius attempted to "disrupt and overturn the constitution of the Church in Palestine", see Binns (1994) 181.

²¹³ Cyril Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVI, recounts how a certain Zachariah visited Sabas in prison and told him to pretend to support the monophysite cause to the new *dux*, Anastasius, son of Pamphilus, but later double back on his promise. See also Theoph. AM 6005.

²¹⁴ Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVI, Theoph. AM 6005, Niceph. Cal. XVI.34, Mansi (1762) VIII.376ff, with Charanis (1974) 102.

²¹⁵ Theod. Lect. 517ff, with Peeters (1950) 8–25.

²¹⁶ For the letter of Theodosius and Sabas, see Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LVII. On the power of the monasteries and their influence in dictating church policy, see Gray (1979) 43.

Trishagion was not being used in Egypt.²¹⁷

Meanwhile, the orthodox eastern clergy did not hesitate to seek support. In 516, many eastern clergy recognised the pope, Hormisdas, and two hundred and seventeen archimandrites and monks signed his definition of faith. They addressed Hormisdas as the most holy and blessed patriarch and emphasised the primacy of the see of Rome.²¹⁸ They [or Hormisdas?] accused Severus of denouncing the "holy Synod of Chalcedon" (*sanctam Chalcedonensem synodum*) and "our blessed father Leo" (*beatissimum patrem nostrum Leonem*), and complained of his use of violence, as in the massacre of three hundred and fifty orthodox monks on pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Simeon the Stylite. Hormisdas replied with a long letter giving encouragement, urging them to continue their fight for orthodoxy, and again drawing the distinction between secular and sacred powers: "Have nothing to do with anything that goes against the rules of the Fathers, whatever be the explanation. Let no one trouble you with unseemly orders or novelties. For, if those persons belong to the laity, they should have no authority over the churches, since it behoves them to be taught rather than to teach. It is uncanonical [for them] to offer profane sacrifices on the holy altars, because God has very clearly prescribed the divine rules. He has allotted different tasks to the Levites and to the people; and the powers of the laity are not the same as the ministeria of the priests".²¹⁹

Such correspondence continued between the east and the west to the end of Anastasius' reign. An epistle dated 10th February, 518 carried encouragement from the pope to the presbyters, deacons and archimandrites of Syria Secunda and the other orthodox of the east, urging them to bear insults calmly, serve the faith and reject Nestorius and Eutyches.²²⁰

²¹⁷ Sev. Hom. Cath. 125, PO 29.1.249.

²¹⁸ *sanctissimo et beatissimo universi orbis terrae patriarchae Hormisdas continentem sedem principis apostolorum Petri deprecatio et supplicatio*. Gunther (1895–1898) no.139; Devreese (1945) 71.

²¹⁹ *quicquid adversum regulas patrum de quibuslibet commentariis profertur, abicite. nullos vos incongruentibus praeceptis aut novis moveat institutis: si enim mundani sunt, ecclesias tenere non possunt, quia eis convenit magis discere quam docere. nefas enim altaribus piis peregrina inferre libamina, quia certos religiosiis disciplinis terminos deus inter ipsa quoque cultus sui praescripsit initia. inter Levitas et populum suum divisit officium; alia est potestas hominum, alia ministeria sacerdotum*. Gunther (1895–1898) no.140 (tr. Dvornik (1966) 813). These are much the same sentiments as those expressed by Gelasius and Symmachus.

²²⁰ Mansi (1762) VIII.1024, Thiel (1868) 820ff, and Jaffé (1885–1888) no.800.

Developments in the Balkans

The eastern clergy were not alone in their hope of support from Rome.²²¹ In a letter written at the beginning of October, 516, John, bishop-elect of Nicopolis, consented to sign Hormisdas' *libellus*, and asked the pope "to take care of all churches and that of Nicopolis according to the habit of your apostolic see".²²² The bishops of Epirus who met at a local synod to confirm his ordination followed John's example.²²³ The pope had previously announced in a letter the defection of many Illyrian bishops from Dorotheus, the bishop of Thessalonica, who was afraid to break off communion with the patriarch of Constantinople, Timothy.²²⁴ Relations between the imperial capital and its Balkan provinces had been strained for some time. According to Marcellinus Comes: "Anastasius ordered some catholic priests of Illyricum to be presented to his sight, especially Laurence of Lychnidos, Domnio of Serdica, Alcissus of Nicopolis, Gaianus of Naissus and Evangelus of Pautalia. The bishops Alcissus and Gaianus died at Byzantium and were buried in one tomb".²²⁵

The most significant sign of Hormisdas' success in winning the Balkans to Rome's side was the letter of 12th January, 515 from Dorotheus, which addressed Hormisdas as a peace-maker and "champion of the true faith who never errs".²²⁶ He respected the Roman see, wishing that "through the humanity of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, and through the intercession of the apostle Peter, most blessed above all, and Paul, the most wise above all, due honour may in justice be given and reserved to their see and to your beatitude, in order that in your

²²¹ It is clear that Rome was pleased to offer assistance. The extant correspondence of Hormisdas shows that, like his predecessors, he was very concerned about the monophysite controversy and imperial influence not just in the east. Although it was unlikely that he could ever create a universal church encompassing the eastern empire and the western barbarian kingdoms, he could at least aim to unite the western bishops with Rome against Constantinople. See further Amory (1997) 208–209.

²²² *ut iuxta consuetudinem apostolicae sedis vestrae cunctarum ecclesiarum curam et Nicopolitanorum habere*. Gunther (1895–1898) no.117 (tr. Dvornik (1958) 127). The Illyrian bishops had previously sought the help of the pope; see the letter purportedly from them to Symmachus asking his help in promoting orthodoxy; Jaffé (1885–1888) no.763, Thiel (1868) 709, Mansi (1762) VIII.221.

²²³ Thiel (1868) 772–774.

²²⁴ Thiel (1868) 756–761, Theod. Lect. 521, Theoph. AM 6008.

²²⁵ *Laurentium praeterea Lychnidensem, Domnionem Serdicensem, Alcissum Nicopolitanum, Gaianum Naisitanum et Evangelum Pautaliensem, catholicos Illyrici sacerdotes, suis Anastasius praesentari iussit obtutibus. Alcissus et Gaianus episcopi apud Byzantium vita defuncti sunt unoque sepulchro reconditi*. Marc. C. 516 (tr. Croke).

²²⁶ *rectae numquam errantem propugnatorem fidei*. Thiel (1868) 742–745, Gunther (1895–1898) no.105 (tr. Dvornik (1958) 124).

time the apostolic see may obtain with due honour something like a second principate, so that all discord may be banned from the church".²²⁷ This was certainly a change of policy by Dorotheus, who had previously maintained communion with the patriarchate of Constantinople.²²⁸

The Revolt of Vitalian

As opposition in the east mounted against Severus and the monophysites, and the Balkans sided openly with Rome, the orthodox cause was further assisted by the rebellion of the *comes foederatorum*, Vitalian, who tried to force Anastasius into negotiations with Rome.

The sources provide us with some background information about Vitalian. He was the son of Patriciolus, the previous *comes foederatorum*, and they had both fought in the Persian war.²²⁹ The only evidence that he was married comes from the account of Zachariah of Mytilene, who comments that he behaved particularly cruelly towards Hypatius, the emperor's nephew, because the latter had insulted his wife.²³⁰ Michael the Syrian believed that Vitalian was the nephew of Macedonius, but perhaps only because of the ostentatious support he gave to the deposed patriarch.²³¹ Confusion surrounds his nationality. From John of Antioch we learn that he was born in Zalbada in Moesia Secunda. However, he is termed *Vitalianus Scythia* by Marcellinus *Comes*, and Thracian (Θρακῆς γένος) by Evagrius and Malalas, while

Zachariah of Mytilene indicated that his family was of Gothic descent.²³² The nationality of the troops which he commanded in his capacity as *comes foederatorum* in Thrace is also problematical.²³³ Malalas, Theophanes and Cedrenus record Huns and Bulgars, while John of Antioch and Evagrius refer only to Huns.²³⁴ The key point is that Vitalian was able to harness the support of various groups, including the bishops, and mount a rebellion against the state. From John of Antioch's description of him as a small man with a stammer, he hardly appears the figure of a charismatic general able to unite the masses behind a cause or lead an army to victory against the imperial forces. Yet Vitalian obviously enjoyed great influence in the Balkans and he was able to exploit, while pursuing his private ambition of succession to the imperial throne, two controversial issues: namely, the religious and the fiscal policies of Anastasius.²³⁵

Contemporary writers record both motives for the war. Malalas

²³² Marc. C. 514, cf. Stein (1949) II.178; Evag. III.43; Mal. 402 followed by Zon. XIV.3.35 36 and Niceph. Cal. XVI.38, and Zach. of Myt. VII.13 and VIII.2. Stein (1949) II.178, Barnea (1960) 363 and Croke (1995) 117 believe that Vitalian was half Roman and half Gothic; contra Charanis (1974) 81 who states that he was half Hunnic and half Gothic. Stein (1949) II.179–180, referring to Schwartz (1934) 252f, comments on the close relationship between Theoderic and Vitalian, which perhaps stemmed from their shared nationality. However, there is only Zachariah's evidence for Vitalian's Gothic roots and Patriciolus is hardly a Gothic name. Mommsen (1872) 349 and Ensslin (1961) col.374 also discuss the issue of Vitalian's nationality, as does Vasiliev (1950) 108 who suggests Slavic descent and Vulpe (1938) 325 who describes Vitalian as the "Romanised son of a Gothic *comes*". See also the discussion in Amory (1997) 127ff and 435.

²³³ Vitalian as *comes foederatorum* would be under the orders of the *magister militum per Thracias* and would have had command of some of the regiments of federates stationed in Thrace.

²³⁴ Georg. Mon. 619 mentions Goths, Huns and Scythians, contra Mal. 402, Theoph. AM 6006, Cedr. 632, John of Ant. fr.214e.1 and Evag. III.43. The problem is discussed at length in the secondary sources; e.g. Mommsen (1872) 350. Bury (1923) I.448 and Charanis (1974) 81 believe that the troops were mainly Bulgarians, contra Ensslin (1961) col.374 and Capizzi (1969) 123 who comment that Vitalian had a great number of Bulgars and Huns. The problem probably arose because contemporary writers themselves were unsure about these rather distant (though terrifying) and relatively recent tribes who threatened the peripheral provinces of the empire; cf. Barnea (1960) 364.

²³⁵ On Vitalian's undoubted influence and popularity with his army, Manojlović (1936) 659 and Duchesne (1925) 37. Even his enemies acknowledged his skill and courage in war, Charanis (1974) 81. However, that he simply manipulated the religious discord and utilised the dissatisfaction of the *foederati* under his care and genuine poverty of the rural population in order to bring about the deposition of Anastasius seems indisputable. Bury (1923) I.447 remarked that Anastasius' unpopularity over his ecclesiastical policy and his economic legislation in Thrace created an ideal opportunity for an ambitious soldier such as Vitalian to attempt to dethrone him. Hodgkin (1895–1899) 459 also believed that Vitalian feigned interest in the theological dispute as a pretext for war, while taking advantage of the grievances of his army over their loss of pay. The Huns, as ever, needed little encouragement to ravage Roman territory. Vasiliev (1932) 143 and Lamma (1939–1940) 186 agree that Vitalian's goals were essentially political.

²²⁷ *humanitate quidem Domini et Dei nostri Iesu Christi, intercessionibus autem in cunctis beatissimi apostoli Petri et in omnibus sapientissimi Pauli; ut venerandae eorum sedi et tuae beatitudini iuste debitus honor custodiatur atque reddatur, ut nostris temporibus velut secundum principatum sedes apostolicae honorem congruentem suscipiat, et omnis discordia recedat.* Thiel (1868) 742ff, Gunther (1895–1898) no.105 (tr. Dvornik (1958) 124). See also Charanis (1974) 80.

²²⁸ Cf. Cessi (1920) 220f, Dvornik (1958) 124.

²²⁹ For an introduction to Vitalian, see especially John of Ant. fr.214e.1 with Josh. 60, Proc. BP. I.8.3, Vict. Tun. 510, Theoph. AM 6005; cf. Barnea (1960) 363. On Patriciolus, PLRE II.837.

²³⁰ Zach. of Myt. VII.13; cf. Greatrex (1996) 123ff who also notes the theory that during the years 518–520 Vitalian and Hypatius worked in cooperation after the latter's switch from a pro-monophysite to a pro-Chalcedonian belief.

²³¹ Mich. Syr. IX.9; cf. Ensslin (1961) col.374. Croke (1995) 117 suggests that Vitalian and Macedonius were cousins. A close friendship between Vitalian and Flavian has also been proposed; CMH I.485, Bury (1923) I.448, Capizzi (1969) 123, contra Stein (1949) II.179, n.2 who suggests that Flavian was Vitalian's godfather. However, Vitalian's relationship with Macedonius and Flavian may be nothing more than a supposition to explain his concern about the "banishment of bishops" (τοὺς ἐξορισθέντας ἐπισκόπους), as described by Mal. 402.

begins his account of the insurrection: "During his reign the Thracian Vitalian rebelled, allegedly giving the banishment of the bishops as a pretext"²³⁶ while Theodore Lector wrote: "The orthodox in Scythia, Mysia and other lands invited Vitalian, the son of Patriciolus, *comes foederatorum*, to rise up against the impious Anastasius".²³⁷ John of Antioch, on the contrary, gives as the main reason for the uprising Anastasius' withdrawal of the *annona* owed to the federal troops.²³⁸ From the same source, we also learn that "50,000 soldiers and farmers" (ν' χιλιάδας πολεμικῶν τε καὶ ἀγροίκων ἀνδρῶν) enlisted under Vitalian. The disaffected peasants suffered from the exception to Anastasius' new law which abolished the old system of *coemptio* (the enforced sale of essential provisions at a fixed price) everywhere else, except in Thrace, where the normal tax yield was too low to support the army.²³⁹ Though essential for the maintenance of the army in this province, the *coemptio* would have been a heavy burden for the peasant farmers, especially when they already suffered frequent barbarian raids across the Danube.²⁴⁰ According to Theodore Lector, Vitalian promised gold, weapons and supplies to those who would rally to his cause, thus

²³⁶ ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἐτυράννησε Βιταλιανὸς ὁ Ὁράξ διὰ πρόφασιν τινα, φησί, λέγων ὅτι διὰ τοὺς ἐξορισθέντας ἐπισκόπους, Mal. 402 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott).

²³⁷ Βιταλιανὸν τὸν υἱὸν Πατρικίολου κόμητος φοιδαράτων οἱ ἐν Σκυθία καὶ Μυσία καὶ λοιπαῖς χώραις ὀρθόδοξοι παρεκάλουν κινηθῆναι κατὰ Ἀναστασίου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς; Theod. Lect. 503 and Theoph. AM 6005 (tr. Mango and Scott). See also Marc. C. 514, Zach. of Myt. VIII.2, and Vict. Tun. 510. Stein (1949) II.179 suggests that Vitalian was in contact with the Holy See from a very early stage; cf. Cessi (1920) 219. On relations between the pope, Vitalian and the bishops of the Balkans, see Amory (1997) 130f, and on Vitalian's relations with the Scythian monks, see the discussion by Charanis (1974) 81 who refers to F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, Leipzig (1887) 293ff and E. Schwartz, 'De Monachis Scythiis' in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* t.4, vol.2, Munich (1914) v ff.

²³⁸ John of Ant. fr.214e.1. This could explain the unpopularity of the *magister militum*, Hypatius, who might be blamed for implementing this legislation which would have deprived the *foederati* of provisions to which they were entitled; cf. Zach. of Myt. VII.13. On the withdrawal of the *annona*, Barnea (1960) 363–364 and PLRE II.1172. Mommsen (1872) 350 comments on how easy it would be for Vitalian, as leader of the *foederati*, to stir up discontent. The reason for this provocative legislation in a programme of generally carefully thought out and non-controversial economic reforms, is unknown. It has been suggested that as the numbers of *foederati* increased, it was impossible to maintain from the imperial treasury the *annona* due to them, cf. Holmes (1905) 180. It is well known that Thrace, seriously affected by barbarian incursions, found it hard to pay its taxes and could not produce enough *annona* to support its army without the imposition of the *coemptio*. Thus, the reduction of *annona* to troops possibly resulted simply from the inability of the province to provide enough supplies.

²³⁹ See ch. 6, pp.200–201. Manojlović (1968) 659 comments on the support of the Balkan peasants who were opposed to Oriental monophysitism. It is more likely, though, that the financial complaints were more immediate.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Barnea (1960) 363–364.

suggesting that the poverty and harsh conditions of these Danubian regions played no small part in Vitalian's revolt.²⁴¹

The Beginning of the Conflict²⁴²

Vitalian began his uprising in 514,²⁴³ with the murder of two senior officials on the staff of the *magister militum*, Celerinus and Constantine.²⁴⁴ The general at this time, Hypatius (not the emperor's nephew), was unpopular, most likely as a result of Anastasius' recent legislation withdrawing the *annona* from the federal troops.²⁴⁵ Moesia Secunda quickly fell into Vitalian's hands after he had won over by bribery the *dux*, Maxentius,²⁴⁶ and Carinus, a financial official and a friend of Hypatius, was captured. Vitalian offered to spare his life in return for the imperial gold he had in his possession and a promise that he would hand over Odessos which, as the headquarters of the *magister militum per Thracias*, was a city of great strategic importance.²⁴⁷ With a force numbering fifty thousand, Vitalian then advanced towards Constantinople, while Hypatius withdrew inside the city walls.²⁴⁸

In response to the supposed doctrinal motives behind the rebellion, Anastasius fixed bronze crosses on the city gates and he displayed on the altar of the Great Church parchment inscribed with Vitalian's real

²⁴¹ Theod. Lect. 503. Zach. of Myt. VII.13 emphasised the amount of gold and booty seized by Vitalian in his first offensive, which was obviously important in maintaining the loyalty of his allies.

²⁴² See above, ch. 4 p.110 for a map of the Balkans showing the area of conflict.

²⁴³ Marc. C. 514 contra Theoph. AM 6005. CMH I.485, Bury (1923) I.448, Stein (1949) II.180 and Capizzi (1969) 123 all follow Theophanes' dating of 513. However, a 514 start better suits the dating of two letters sent by Anastasius to the pope Hormisdas (discussed later) just after the first phase of the rebellion in December, 514 and January, 515; cf. Charanis (1974) 81 and Croke (1995) 117. Again, it makes better sense to follow the sixth-century Marcellinus than the often inaccurate ninth-century Theophanes.

²⁴⁴ They were both *assessores*; PLRE II.275, Celerinus and PLRE II.315, Constantinus 16.

²⁴⁵ The two Hypatii are sometimes confused; e.g. Mommsen (1872) 349–350, Stein (1949) II.178 and Croke (1995) 117. For discussion, Lamma (1939–40) 187, Greatrex (1996) 132; 140–142 and Mango (1997) 241. Bury (1923) I.448 comments on this Hypatius' unpopularity with the army; cf. PLRE II.577, Hypatius 5, with references.

²⁴⁶ Cf. PLRE II.738.

²⁴⁷ John of Ant. fr.214e.1; PLRE II.261, Carinus 3.

²⁴⁸ John of Ant. fr.214e.1 contra Marc.C. 514 who gives the figure of sixty thousand; cf. Croke (1995) 117. This force included his *foederati*, reinforced by rustic peasants. Stein (1949) II.180 comments on the extraordinary number of this army, raised by a rebel, at this time. It was said that Hypatius did not have enough troops on hand to face the barbarian multitude, John of Ant. fr.214e.1, Mal. 402, Capizzi (1969) 124.

motive: usurpation of the imperial throne.²⁴⁹ Undeterred, however, Vitalian established himself at the Hebdomon (seven miles from the city centre) and began to close on the Golden Gate.²⁵⁰ It was also at this time that Anastasius reduced taxes on the imports of livestock into Asia Minor by twenty-five per cent. This measure has been seen as the emperor's response to the perceived criticism of his economic policy as a motive for the uprising.²⁵¹ Incidentally, such a reform might have helped to ensure a safe reception should Anastasius have been forced to flee across the Bosphorus after a successful assault by Vitalian.

On these and subsequent events, most sources give confused or compressed accounts as outlined briefly below. Malalas reports that after Vitalian had gained control of Thrace and Scythia as far as Odessos and Anchialus, Anastasius sent out Hypatius, the *magister militum*, who was betrayed and captured, thus attributing to the first Hypatius the fate of the second (the emperor's nephew).²⁵² Evagrius has Vitalian devastating Thrace and Moesia as far as Odessos and Anchialus and then attacking Constantinople with Hunnic troops. Hypatius was captured owing to the treachery of his own men and had to be ransomed.²⁵³ Theophanes describes a battle in which sixty-five thousand Romans fell, a confrontation he has obviously confused with a later battle in which John of Antioch reported that sixty thousand out of the eighty thousand imperial troops perished.²⁵⁴

It is clear that Vitalian did encamp around the walls of Constantinople. Marcellinus *Comes* recorded thus: "Next, misled and deluded by the pretences and lies of Anastasius through his intermediary Theodorus, he departed on the eighth day after reaching the city".²⁵⁵ An account of the agreed settlement is found in the history of John of Antioch. Patricius, the *magister militum praesentalis* in the Persian war (502–506) and a benefactor of Vitalian, was sent to negotiate, and Vitalian, though too mistrustful to enter the capital himself, agreed to

²⁴⁹ John of Ant. fr.214e.2; Hodgkin (1895–99) 461.

²⁵⁰ Marc. C. 514. *PLRE* II.1172 describes how Vitalian arranged his troops from sea to sea, so that the city was cut off by land, and then moved relentlessly towards the Golden Gate without opposition.

²⁵¹ See John of Ant. fr.214e.2; Stein (1949) II.181, n.1; and below, ch. 6 p.221.

²⁵² Mal. 402 followed by Holmes (1905) 180 and Vulpe (1938) 325. *PLRE* II.1172 comments that Vitalian controlled Thrace, Moesia Secunda and Scythia and refers to the following primary sources, Mal. 402, Evag. III.43, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.72, Theoph. AM 6006, Cedr. 632 and Zon. XIV.3.28.

²⁵³ Evag. III.43, cf. Zach. of Myt. VII.13.

²⁵⁴ Theoph. AM 6005.

²⁵⁵ *porro Anastasii simulationibus atque periuriis per Theodorum internuntium inlectus atque inlusus octavo die quam urbem accesserat remeavit.* Marc. C. 514 (tr. Croke).

send his most senior officers to negotiate.²⁵⁶ His goals were two-fold: Hypatius must be removed and the injustices to the *foederati* remedied, and the church of Rome should be allowed to settle the doctrinal rift.²⁵⁷ According to other sources, the deposed patriarchs, Macedonius and Flavian, were to be reinstated.²⁵⁸ Negotiations were conducted on Anastasius' behalf by Theodorus.²⁵⁹ Wooed by gifts, the officers were easily convinced by the emperor's promises of compliance and returned to Vitalian, who had little choice but to retreat to Moesia Secunda and await developments.

The Second Stage of Conflict

It is interesting that Anastasius had no thought of forcing a physical confrontation. It is probable that he had insufficient forces on hand for a full defence of Constantinople and it was sound strategy to employ diplomatic means to remove Vitalian from the immediate vicinity of his capital and continue the war in enemy territory.²⁶⁰ The unpopular Hypatius was replaced by Cyril, who was despatched forthwith to Moesia Secunda in pursuit of Vitalian.²⁶¹ Again, however, there are discrepancies in the sources as to subsequent events. Malalas reports that there was a battle in which many fell. Cyril was successful eventually and entered Odessos, but Vitalian bribed the gate-keepers and, pursuing the general into the town, slaughtered him in his residence.²⁶² On the other hand, Evagrius states that the first battle was indecisive and that Cyril was routed due to the desertion of his own soldiers and was captured in Odessos.²⁶³ Marcellinus and John of Antioch do not mention any preliminary hostilities, only relating that Vitalian went to Odessos and killed Cyril there.²⁶⁴ Theophanes mentions the capture of Cyril, but his

²⁵⁶ *PLRE* II.840–842, Patricius 14; cf. Greatrex (1996) 125–127.

²⁵⁷ Bury (1923) I.449, Stein (1949) II.180, Capizzi (1969) 124 and Charanis (1974) 82–83. See also Marc. C. 514 and Vict. Tun. 510.

²⁵⁸ Theod. Lect. 509 and Cedr. 632.

²⁵⁹ *PLRE* II.1095, Theodorus 55.

²⁶⁰ At such short notice and with the city cut off by Vitalian's manoeuvres, it was impossible for Anastasius to recall troops from elsewhere in the empire; cf. Capizzi (1969) 124.

²⁶¹ Thus Mal. 402, Evag. III.43 and John of Ant. fr.214e.5; cf. *PLRE* II.335, Cyril 3.

²⁶² Mal. 402, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.76.

²⁶³ Evag. III.43. Croke (1995) 118 and *PLRE* II.1173 believe that there were several indecisive encounters before Cyril then withdrew to Odessos.

²⁶⁴ Marc. C. 514.3 portrays Cyril as more of a pimp than a general: "Vitalian found Cyril, a soft rather than a hardy Master of the Soldiery, sleeping between two concubines" (*Cyrillum lenocinantem magis quam strenuum militiae ductorem inter duas paelices Vitalianus reperit dormientem*) (tr. Croke); contra John of Ant. fr.214e.5 who described

account is very confused. He compresses different parts of the campaign: the capture of Odessos, the slaughter of Cyril, the plundering up to Constantinople and the second attack on the city from Sosthenium, all in the same sentence.²⁶⁵

As it is probable that Vitalian already held Odessos, having gained possession of it from Carinus, it seems likely that there was a battle which ended in victory for Cyril and gave him control of Odessos, to where he now retreated. If Odessos had still been held by Vitalian's rebel troops, it would hardly have been a suitable place to which Cyril might withdraw. Moreover, if Vitalian had to fight or bribe the guards to let him in, this implies that the city was no longer in his hands. There is no report of the town changing hands by agreement, so it can be assumed that Cyril managed to regain control of it during a battle at this time.

When Anastasius heard about this incident, he had Vitalian decreed a public enemy by the traditional method of senatorial decree.²⁶⁶ He then appointed Alathar, a Hun, as the new *magister militum per Thracias*, placed his nephew (Hypatius) in supreme command of the army and Theodorus in charge of finances, and consigned eighty thousand soldiers to the expedition.²⁶⁷

The clearest and fullest account of subsequent developments can again be found in the history of John of Antioch.²⁶⁸ The first engagement went in favour of the imperial forces, after which Anastasius held a celebratory ceremony in the Great Church. However, serious reverses followed, including the humiliating capture of Julian, an official in the bureau of the *magister memoriae*, who had followed the expedition as an observer.²⁶⁹ Another official, Timothy, one of the *protectores*, was killed in the hostilities.²⁷⁰ With his army, Hypatius withdrew hurriedly behind a palisade of wagons at Acræ on the Black Sea, near Odessos, but the enemy mounted a surprise attack and easily penetrated the crude defence. The imperial troops fled, terrified. Many were slaughtered by the enemy, while others perished by falling down precipices in

Cyril as neither stupid, nor inexperienced in warfare: οὐκ ἀσυνέτω, οὐδὲ πολεμικῆς ἐμπειρίας ἀμαθεῖ. See also Stein (1949) II.180.

²⁶⁵ Theoph. AM 6006; cf. Mango (1997) 243–244. Mommsen (1872) 353 comments on the differences between the accounts. On Vitalian's suspicions of Cyril's plans and surprise attack on Cyril, Capizzi (1969) 124.

²⁶⁶ John of Ant. fr.214e.6, Jord. Rom. 358.

²⁶⁷ PLRE II.49–50, Alathar, PLRE II.577–581, Hypatius 6, esp. p.579. The figure of eighty thousand is surely an exaggeration, cf. Stein (1949) II.180.

²⁶⁸ John of Ant. fr.214e.6–11. But see also the relevant sections of Mal. 402–403, Evag. III.43 and Theoph. AM 6006.

²⁶⁹ Julian was carried about in a cage before being ransomed, PLRE II.641, Julianus 25.

²⁷⁰ John of Ant. fr.214e.7, cf. Mommsen (1872) 353 and PLRE II.1122, Timothy 5.

the darkness brought about, as John of Antioch wrote, by the magic arts of the barbarians. Sixty thousand Romans died on this occasion, a figure no doubt exaggerated, but indicative of the scale of the disaster for the imperial forces. Several senior officers were captured, including Alathar.²⁷¹ Hypatius tried to escape by jumping into the sea, but his head betrayed him and he too was captured by the Huns. They accepted ransom from Vitalian who kept the emperor's nephew as a valuable negotiating pawn.²⁷² An imperial embassy consisting of Uranius, Polychronius and Martyrius, sent out to negotiate with ransom money totalling one thousand one hundred pounds of gold, was seized at Sozopolis and the town fell into the rebel's possession.²⁷³ These victories enabled Vitalian to pay his barbarian allies richly and gave him possession of all the fortresses and cities of Moesia and Scythia.²⁷⁴

For a second time, Vitalian was in a position to bring his forces to the suburbs of the imperial city.²⁷⁵ At this time, there was a faction riot in the capital caused by a ban by Anastasius on the celebration of certain festivities.²⁷⁶ The extent to which Vitalian encouraged or was encouraged by this riot cannot be determined. Many see a clear link between the riot and Vitalian's operations,²⁷⁷ but their reasons are unconvincing. There is nothing to suggest that the riot was in any way different to the many other factional disturbances which had plagued Anastasius earlier in his reign. There is no evidence that the people of Constantinople wanted to depose Anastasius as they had Zeno, when they lent assistance to Marcian in 479. Vitalian and his army surrounded Constantinople on three separate occasions giving the towns-

²⁷¹ See CMH I.485, Stein (1949) II.181 and Ensslin (1961) col.375. Alathar and his colleagues were captured by the Bulgars and then ransomed by Vitalian.

²⁷² PLRE II.1173 comments that Vitalian's treatment of Hypatius during captivity was especially humiliating (he was kept in a pigsty), because Hypatius had formerly insulted his wife, cf. Zach. of Myt. VII.13 and VIII.2.

²⁷³ PLRE II.1187, Uranius 6, PLRE II.896, Polychronius 3, and PLRE II.732, Martyrius 7. On this embassy and its capture, Marc. C. 515 and John of Ant. fr.214e.11.

²⁷⁴ See Bury (1923) I.450, Stein (1949) II.181, Ensslin (1961) col.376 and Charanis (1974) 84.

²⁷⁵ On the date, mentioned as 514 by Capizzi (1969) 125, see Stein (1949) II.180f, Peeters (1950) 21 and Ensslin (1961) cols.375–376.

²⁷⁶ John of Ant. fr. 214e.12. The night prefect, Geta, was killed in the disturbances, PLRE II.511.

²⁷⁷ Brooks in CMH I.485 wrote that it was now expected that Vitalian would be proclaimed emperor. Capizzi (1969) 125 believed that Vitalian would have been very encouraged by the riot and would be confident of help from the populace during an attack on the city. Charanis (1974) 84 thought that Vitalian would be emboldened by the dual danger threatening Anastasius. Stein (1949) II.181 commented that the success of Vitalian at Acræ gave courage to the masses who then rioted. Vulpe (1938) 325 went as far as to say that the inhabitants of Constantinople, rioting against Anastasius, were ready to open the gates to Vitalian.

people plenty of opportunity to betray their city, yet there is no hint of any such attempt. It was perhaps helpful that Anastasius' attention may have been momentarily distracted, but it was a serious miscalculation on Vitalian's part if he hoped to channel the grievances of the factions into his own cause. As will become evident later, it was Anastasius who utilised most effectively the power of the factions.

In his second attack on Constantinople, Vitalian sent ahead his cavalry and a fleet of two hundred ships,²⁷⁸ while he and his army marched along the coast until they reached Sosthenium at the northern end of the city.²⁷⁹ Again, and probably more so after the disastrous loss at Acrae, Anastasius was in no mood for battle. He sent John, the *magister militum praesentalis*, known as the son of Valeriana, with other senators to negotiate.²⁸⁰ The terms of the treaty included the ransom of Hypatius for nine hundred pounds of gold and gifts,²⁸¹ the appointment of Vitalian as *magister militum per Thracias*, and Anastasius' promise to convene a synod at Heraclea to be attended by all bishops.²⁸² That ransom was an important part of the negotiation indicates that financial gain was a key issue for Vitalian.²⁸³ On the stipulation of Vitalian, the treaty was confirmed by the emperor, the senate, the leaders of each division of the *scholarioi* and the people.²⁸⁴

In the end, these objectives were not met, though this was not for lack of serious attempts by the emperor to heal the rift with the western church. On 28th December, 514, Anastasius despatched a letter inviting Hormisdas to preside over the synod at Heraclea which was to be held

²⁷⁸ The fleet was gathered in Thracian ports. On the use of his fleet here, Duchesne (1925) 37f.

²⁷⁹ See John of Ant. fr.214e.13, Mal. 405, Marc. C. 515, Vict. Tun. 514, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.77, Theoph. AM 6006.

²⁸⁰ PLRE II.608, John 60; Hodgkin (1895–1899) 462 comments that again Anastasius had no intention of keeping any of the agreements reached in these negotiations.

²⁸¹ Cf. John of Ant. fr.214e.14 and Marc. C. 514.3. The exact sum of ransom has been much discussed. Marcellinus mentions the nine hundred pounds demanded here and the one thousand one hundred pounds offered previously and captured at Sozopolis, a total of two thousand pounds of gold. As John of Antioch mentions a sum of five thousand pounds, this must include the extra gifts demanded by Vitalian which must have amounted to three thousand pounds. See Stein (1949) II.181, PLRE II.1173 and Croke (1995) 118. Greatrex (1996) 133 notes that the dating of 516–517 given by Peeters (1948) 162ff for Hypatius' ransom must be incorrect as Hypatius was in Jerusalem by 516. For a completely different tradition, see Theodore Lector 511 and Theophanes AM 6006 where Hypatius' father, Secundinus, begs Vitalian to release his son from chains in Moesia.

²⁸² John of Ant. fr.214e.14, Theod. Lect. 510, Vict. Tunn. 514, Theoph. AM 6006 and Cedr. 632. It was arranged that both Vitalian and Anastasius should contact Hormisdas; it was imperative that Rome was represented, cf. Schwartz (1934) 252f.

²⁸³ Cf. Greatrex (1996) 133, contra Peeters (1948) 162ff.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Capizzi (1969) 125.

on 1st July, 515.²⁸⁵ This letter, however, did not reach the pope until 14th May, 515, arriving later than a second epistle from the emperor, which was sent on 12th January, 515 and arrived on 14th March, 515.²⁸⁶ These letters reveal genuine imperial desire for a council to heal the differences between the east and west.²⁸⁷ There was also hope that the new pope, Hormisdas, would be rather less intransigent than his predecessor for, on his accession, he had even reinstated the remnants of the Laurentian party. It is not clear why two letters were sent so close together. It is possible that Vitalian, suspicious of Anastasius' interventions after reneging on their previous treaty, vetted the first letter or sent it to the court at Ravenna to be checked. The second letter was sent directly to the pope, Anastasius perhaps aware that the first might be intercepted.²⁸⁸

Hormisdas replied to the first letter, defending Symmachus, but he emphasised a desire for good will and asked for more information about the proposed synod.²⁸⁹ On receiving the second letter he decided to send an embassy, but even before it arrived the bishops had already met and dispersed, with no agreement being reached.²⁹⁰ The embassy eventually arrived at Constantinople on 11th August, 515. The ambassadors were Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, Fortunatus of Caria, Venantius (a priest), Vitalis (a deacon), and Hilary (a notary).²⁹¹ They carried four documents: a letter addressed to the emperor,²⁹² the *Indiculus*,²⁹³ the formula of Hormisdas (the *libellus*)²⁹⁴ and a papal letter to Vitalian which is no longer extant. The *Indiculus* was a set of instructions to the envoys governing their every movement. It contained precise guidelines concerning where to stay, what invitations to accept, whom to see

²⁸⁵ Gunther (1895–1898) no.109, Thiel (1868) 741 (tr. Coleman-Norton (1966) 955–956). Anastasius hoped that after the synod "there can be no doubt or discord" (*ut deinceps nulla possit esse dubitatio vel discordia*).

²⁸⁶ Gunther (1895–1898) no.107, Thiel (1868) 742, Mansi (1762) VIII.384 and Coleman-Norton (1966) 956–957.

²⁸⁷ Cf. Coleman-Norton (1966) 956.

²⁸⁸ Sundwall (1919) 223, n.1, Stein (1949) II.182, contra Capizzi (1969) 126 who believes that the first letter was deliberately delayed by Anastasius himself.

²⁸⁹ Jaffé (1885–1888) no.771, Thiel (1868) 745 and Gunther (1895–1898) no.108.

²⁹⁰ Contra Cedr. 632 who states that Anastasius violated the treaty; he omits all mention of communication between emperor and popes.

²⁹¹ *Liber Pontificalis* I.269, cf. Frend (1972) 232 and on Ennodius, Amory (1997) 206.

²⁹² Mansi (1762) VIII.388, Thiel (1868) 747, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.773, and Gunther (1895–1898) no.110.

²⁹³ Mansi (1762) VIII.389, Thiel (1868) 748ff, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.774, and Gunther (1895–1898) no.116. See further Cessi (1920) 228ff, Hodgkin (1885) III.464–469 and Charanis (1974) 89–90.

²⁹⁴ Mansi (1762) VIII.393, Thiel (1868) 755f, Jaffé (1885–1888) no.775, and Gunther (1895–1898) no.115, with Charanis (1974) 90f.

and, most importantly, specific answers to expected questions from the emperor. It was forbidden that there should be any discussion between Anastasius and the legates before the emperor had read the papal letters, and any such attempts were to be fended off. Thus: "Salutations to your Piety and thanks to God for making you desire the unity of the Church; read and you will see".²⁹⁵ The emperor was certainly not allowed to see the papal letter to Vitalian. After the reading of the documents, the envoys may say, for example, "Your father salutes you, daily entreating God and commending your kingdom to the intercession of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, that God who has put this desire into your heart, to work for the happiness of the church, may carry it to perfection".²⁹⁶ If Anastasius accepted Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, they were to kiss his breast and thank God for his conversion to orthodoxy. Hormisdas agreed, for the sake of peace and unity, to attend the council called by the emperor, although there was no precedent for such an honour. In return, he expected complete support from the emperor, of the kind Marcian and Leo I had given to Pope Leo.

The signing of the *libellus* was of crucial importance. It demanded assurance that the doctrinal formulae agreed at Chalcedon be upheld, that the principal heretics (Nestorius, Dioscorus, Timotheus Aelurus, Peter Mongus and Acacius) be expunged from the diptychs, that all exiled bishops be retried at Rome, and that all cases against catholic bishops be tried in the papal court. There was a long passage about the apostolicity of Rome, and finally, absolute submission of the emperor to the pope was required: "We receive and approve, therefore, all the universal epistles of Pope Leo which he wrote concerning the Christian religion. And, therefore, as we have said, following in all things the apostolic see and approving all of its constitutions, I hope that I shall be worthy to be in one communion with you, that which the apostolic see recommends and in which there is, complete and true, the whole of the Christian religion".²⁹⁷ It is interesting that the *libellus* contained no

²⁹⁵ *salutes ad pietatem vestram continent et deo gratias agit, quia vos sollicitos de unitate cognoscit ecclesiae; legite et agnoscitis* (tr. Charanis (1974) 90).

²⁹⁶ *salutat pater vester, deum cotidie rogans et confessionibus sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli vestrum regnum commendans, ut deus, qui vobis tale desiderium dedit, ut pro causa ecclesiae mitti et consulere beatitudinem ipsius eligeretis. ipse et perfectionem bonae retribuat voluntatis* (tr. Charanis 1974) 90).

²⁹⁷ *quapropter suscipimus et probamus epistolas beati Leonis papae universas, quas de Christiana religione conscripsit. unde, sicut praediximus, sequentes in omnibus apostolicam sedem et praedicantes eius omnia constituta, spero, ut in una communione vobiscum, quam sedes apostolica praedicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax Christianae religionis soliditas*, Gunther (1895–1898) no. 116b (tr. Charanis (1974) 90).

mention of the more recent developments; and the names of Euphemius, Macedonius, Severus and Philoxenus do not feature. Hormisdas was still harking back to the old complaints concerning the supremacy of Rome and Acacius. It is clear that the pope had given no thought as to how Anastasius might go about persuading the still considerable monophysite element of the eastern empire to agree to a circular letter announcing the emperor's adherence to Chalcedon, as he suggested. Agreement to Hormisdas' demands also meant the effacement of the name of Acacius from the diptychs, a proposal that the populace of Constantinople would never allow.²⁹⁸

It is not clear what took place between Anastasius and Ennodius, but it is recorded that the embassy "going to the emperor Anastasius, achieved nothing".²⁹⁹ The embassy returned in the winter of 515 with Anastasius' reply. He asserted that he had never condemned the Synod of Chalcedon openly, that Nestorius and Eutyches had already been anathematised and condemnation of the others would only lead to bloodshed. The living should not suffer on account of the dead.³⁰⁰ He did promise that he would send an imperial embassy at a later date to the pope and closed his letter with the Biblical quotation: "My peace I give to you, my peace I leave with you".³⁰¹

The Defeat of Vitalian

Correspondence was to continue for at least another year or two between Anastasius and Hormisdas, but for Vitalian, this was hardly the reconciliatory response he had demanded, and it provided the excuse to make a third attempt on Constantinople at the end of 515. Before he did so, however, there was an incursion of the Sabir Huns who laid waste Cappadocia as far as Lycaonia.³⁰² John of Antioch mentions this in conjunction with Vitalian's third assault on the capital,

²⁹⁸ Gunther (1895–1898) no. 116a, cf. Charanis (1974) 91 and Gray (1979) 42.

²⁹⁹ *euntes ad Anastasium Augustum, nihil egerunt. Liber Pontificalis* 1.269.

³⁰⁰ Thiel (1868) 761, Gunther (1895–1898) no. 125; translated by Coleman-Norton (1966) 957–960, no. 546. Duchesne (1925) 39 commented that this reply indicated that Anastasius was not afraid of Vitalian. While engaging in correspondence with the popes, it seems that Anastasius ignored Vitalian's request that he restore Macedonius and Flavian to their posts. It is possible that Macedonius was already dead by now, and it would have been virtually impossible to shift Flavian's powerful monophysite successor Severus from his seat in Antioch.

³⁰¹ *pacem meam do vobis, pacem meam dimitto vobis*. Gunther (1895–1898) no. 125, with Charanis (1974) 92 and Grillmeier (1987) II.1.314–315.

³⁰² John of Ant. fr. 214c.15 and Marc. C. 515.

possibly implying that these Huns were working in collusion with the rebel: they would invade the eastern provinces, while Vitalian would strike against Constantinople from the west.³⁰³ It was also in 515, though the exact timing is unknown, that Anastasius removed Vitalian from his position as *magister militum per Thracias* and appointed in his place a certain Rufinus.³⁰⁴ With no immediate prospect of a reconciliation between the churches of the east and the west, Vitalian had every reason to stage another attack on Constantinople.

Vitalian drew up his forces at Sycae³⁰⁵ and Anastasius, determined to respond with force this time, tried to appoint as generals Patricius and John, son of Valeriana, who had negotiated the previous treaties.³⁰⁶ However, they refused, giving the excuse that as they had once been friends of Vitalian they risked the accusation of treachery if they were now defeated.³⁰⁷ Anastasius then gave control of the campaign to the praetorian prefect and financial minister, Marinus the Syrian.³⁰⁸ His eventual victory over Vitalian was made possible by the use of elemental sulphur (θεῖον ἄπυρον), ■ chemical compound invented by the Athenian philosopher, Proclus,³⁰⁹ which was hurled against the enemy ships, thus described by Malalas: "Suddenly all the ships of the rebel Vitalian caught fire and were set ablaze and plunged to the bottom of the Bosphorus, taking with them the Gothic, Hunnish and Scythian soldiers who had joined him".³¹⁰ Once the fleet had been destroyed or

³⁰³ See Mommsen (1872) 357 and Charanis (1974) 93.

³⁰⁴ Marc. C. 516; *PLRE* II.954–957, Rufinus 13, Mommsen (1872) 358, Capizzi (1969) 127, Charanis (1974) 92 and Croke (1995) 119.

³⁰⁵ Vitalian hoped (in vain) that the Isaurians and other mercenary troops stationed in this area would join his cause.

³⁰⁶ Marcellinus *Comes* omits all mention of this third engagement.

³⁰⁷ Mal. 404.

³⁰⁸ *PLRE* II.726–728, Marinus 7. On Marinus in this role, Bury (1923), I.451 and Stein (1949), II.184. That Marinus was substituted for Patricius and John is generally accepted, although it is Justin's role in the defeat of Vitalian which is cited by the reliable John of Antioch. Apparently Justin, at this time in the lowest ranks of the army, attacked one of the rebel ships and captured all its crew, an act which generated such fear that the rest of the fleet fled. If John of Antioch was writing at the beginning of Justin's reign, this might account for his exaggerated role here. It is, of course, perfectly possible that Justin did capture an enemy ship, but that this was just one incident in the battle, and that the main commander was still Marinus. It is probable that Justin's action helped him to secure the throne in 518; cf. Greatrex (1996) 135ff.

³⁰⁹ Mal. 405–406, John of Nikiu LXXXIX.78ff, and Zon. XIV.3.29–30; *PLRE* II.919, Proclus 8. Incendiary weapons had been used from the time of the Assyrians, and Malalas is not referring to the 'Greek fire' invented by Callinicus for use against the Arabs in 678. See further, *ODB* II.873, Partington (1960) *passim*, esp. 5 and Haldon and Byrne (1977).

³¹⁰ καὶ ἀνήφθησαν ἐξαίφνης ὑπὸ πυρὸς τὰ πλοῖα ἅπαντα Βιταλιανοῦ τοῦ τυράννου καὶ ἐποντίσθησαν εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τοῦ ρεῖματος μεθ' ὧν εἶχον Γότθων καὶ Οὐννων καὶ Σκυθῶν στρατιωτῶν συνεπομένων αὐτῷ. (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). The fullest

put to flight, Marinus was able to land his army at Sycae where he successfully engaged with the rebel forces who either managed to escape or were slain.³¹¹

It is probable that some members of the Green faction, led by the charioteer Porphyrius, helped with the defence of Constantinople and in the sea battle. There are possible references to Vitalian's revolt in the epigrams inscribed on the base of a statue dedicated to Porphyrius.³¹²

Οὐ μόνον ἐν σταδίοις σε κατέστεφε πόντια Νίκη,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν πολέμοις δεῖξεν ἀεθλοφόρον,
εὗτ' ἄρ' Ἄναξ πολέμιζεν ἔχων Πρασίνοὺς ὑποεργοὺς
ἄγρια μαινομένῳ ἐχθρῷ ἀνακτορέῳ,
καὶ πέσεν αἰνοτύραννος ἐπιφθιμένης τότε Ῥώμης,
ἤμαρ δ' Αὐσονίης ἦλθεν ἐλευθερίας.
τοῦνεκα τοῖς μὲν ἔδωκεν Ἄναξ γέρας, ὡς πάρος εἶχον,
σὸν δὲ τύπον τέχνη ἐξεσε, Πορφύριε.

Not only did divine Victory crown you on the race-course, but in war, too, she showed you to be victorious, then when the Emperor, with the Greens to assist him, warred with the furiously raging enemy of the throne; when the savage tyrant fell, as Rome was on the point of perishing, and the light of Latin liberty came back. Therefore the Monarch gave to the Greens the privileges they formerly had, and the artist wrought and polished your image, Porphyrius. (*Anthol. Graec.* XVI.350, tr. Paton)

and

ὦφελος ὄπλα φέρειν, οὐ φόρεα ταῦτα κομίζειν,
ὡς ἐλατὴρ τελέθων, καὶ πολέμων πρόμαχος.
εὗτε γὰρ ἦλθεν ἄνακτος ὀλεσσι τυράννος ἀκωκή,
καὶ σὺ συναιχμάζων ἦψαι ναυμαχίης·
καὶ διπλῆς, πολύμητι, σοφῶς ἐδράζαιο νίκης,
τῆς μὲν παλομάχου, τῆς δὲ τυραννοφόνου.

You should have borne arms and not these robes, as being a driver and also a champion in war. For when the tyrant-slaying sword of the emperor went forth you did take up arms, too, and join in the battle of the ships, and, master of many counsels, you did skilfully seize on a double victory, that of the charioteer and that of the tyrannicide.³¹³ (*Anthol. Graec.* XV.50, tr. Paton)

Cameron argues convincingly that both of these epigrams concerning Porphyrius' part as ■ soldier/charioteer (XV.50.2 and 4) in a

account of the battle is given by Mal. 405 (summarised by Evag. III.43) and John of Nikiu LXXXIX.81–84.

³¹¹ See Bury (1923) I.452, n.2 on their position on the Bosphorus shore.

³¹² Cameron (1973) 126–130 and Vasiliev (1948) 43–44.

³¹³ See Cameron (1973) 127 for an explanation of why this poem should be included in the Planudean series between 349 and 350 which both refer to Porphyrius.

sea battle (XV.50.4) against ■ usurper (XVI.350.5) are referring to the war against Vitalian. Sea battles were rare in the sixth century in the Mediterranean and there are no other records of usurpers defeated at sea for this period. The other epigrams on this base also contain references to Porphyrius' dual role

Σὴν τροχαλὴν μάστιγα καὶ ἀσπίδα δῆμος ἀγασθεῖς
ἤθελέ σε στήσαι διπλόον, ὥσπερ ἔδει,
ἡνίοχον κτρατερὸν καὶ ἀριστέα· διχθὰ δὲ χαλκὸς
οὐκ ἐχύθη, ψυχὴν σεῖο τυπωσάμενος.

The people, in admiration of your whirling whip and your shield, was minded to set you up in two aspects as was fitting, as a strong driver and ■ strong warrior; but the bronze, forming itself like your soul, would not flow in two streams. (*Anthol. Graec.* XVI.347, tr. Paton)

and an allusion to Porphyrius' loyalty to Anastasius during the crisis:

Πορφύριον σταδιοῖσι τίνος χάριν ἡνιοχῆα
δῆμος ὁ πρῶτα φέρων ἀνθετο τῶν Πρασίνων;
αὐτὸς Ἄναξ κήρυξε. τί γὰρ πλέον, ὅτι γεραίρει
εἵνεκεν εὐνοίης, εἵνεκεν ἱπποσύνης;

Why did the distinguished faction of the Greens erect on the course the statue of the charioteer Porphyrius? The Emperor himself issued the order. What could he do but honour him in view of his good will to him, and of his skill as a driver?³¹⁴ (*Anthol. Graec.* XVI.348, tr. Paton)

It appears, then, that some members of the Green faction, led by Porphyrius, helped in defence of the city against Vitalian, as at XVI.350.3. It is possible that, as well as manning the walls, they took part in the pursuit of the enemy on the Galata side of the Golden Horn after the fleet had been defeated.³¹⁵ That the factions were involved in active service should perhaps be explained by the urgency of the threat against the city, rather than any desire of the 'monophysite' Greens to keep out the 'orthodox' Vitalian;³¹⁶ the divide of monophysite Greens and orthodox Blues is a largely artificial construct.³¹⁷ It is the Greens

³¹⁴ See Cameron (1973) 128–129; on XVI.347 and its parallels with the other epigrams, 129–130.

³¹⁵ Cameron (1973) 128 notes that this is the earliest recorded military activity of the factions, not otherwise attested until 539. See also Cameron (1976) 107. It is probable that the factions did not play a vital role, as they are mentioned by neither Malalas nor John of Antioch, but it is significant that they remained loyal to the emperor.

³¹⁶ Cameron (1973) 126 and (1976) 133, contra Dvornik (1946) 127 and Vasiliev (1948) 43–44.

³¹⁷ See discussion on the factions in ch. 6, pp.223–229. As mentioned previously, the faction riot which broke out in Constantinople just before Vitalian's third attack was not staged as a deliberate ploy by the Blues in his favour (cf. Manjlovic (1936) 659–660). Confusion

who are mentioned here, because at this time Porphyrius was racing for them, and in appreciation of his support Anastasius allowed his faction to erect a monument in his honour.

After the defeat of his forces, Vitalian fled at night to Anchialus where he remained for the next couple of years.³¹⁸ Many of his supporters were killed, including the Hun, Tarrach, Cyril's assassin, who was tortured and burnt at the stake.³¹⁹ Meanwhile Anastasius led ■ procession to Sosthenium which had been the main headquarters of Vitalian, where he offered thanksgiving for his success.³²⁰

Vitalian remained an exile until after the death of Anastasius in 518; but he was recalled to Constantinople under Justin's edict granting pardon to all those banished by his predecessor. If there was any doubt about the sincerity of Vitalian's supposed motives for revolt, it is clear from his behaviour in the early years of Justin's reign that ambition for imperial power had been his ultimate goal. In his negotiations with Anastasius, apart from the first settlement when he demanded the removal of the unpopular Hypatius from office, the financial claims of the *foederati* are entirely ignored. Instead, Vitalian focused on the theological issues, and it was the promotion of strict orthodoxy which was his main concern under Justin. On his recall from exile, he demanded assurances of faith from both Justin and Justinian. The popularity he gained from his violent persecution of the monophysites made him a dangerous rival to Justinian, who contrived his murder in July, 520.³²¹ As under Anastasius, Vitalian's ambition was only very thinly cloaked by his championship of orthodoxy.

is perhaps caused by Theophanes AM 6005, who states that during the 512 riot the crowds proclaimed Vitalian emperor. He is clearly mistaken, as all other sources report Areobindus as the people's choice of emperor; cf. Marc. C. 512.

³¹⁸ Cf. Mal. 406, John of Ant. fr.214e.16–17, Evag. III.43, Theoph. AM 6007, Cedr. 632–633 and John of Nikiu LXXXIX.86 who wrote: "But Vitalian after his defeat ... fled with his followers in fear and terror ... On the morrow everyone forsook him and left him alone". (tr. Charles).

³¹⁹ John of Ant. fr.214e.17–18. *PLRE* II.1052–1053 and Stein (1949) II.184–185.

³²⁰ Mal. 405 and John of Nikiu LXXXIX.87. Anastasius' victory was celebrated by Severus who composed a hymn "On Vitalian the Tyrant and the Victory of the Christ-loving Anastasius the King", *PO* 7.710.

³²¹ For a full account of Vitalian's brief period of ascendancy under Justin, see Vasiliev (1950) 108–114. Peeters (1950) 49, n.1 comments on the political significance of the capture of Anastasius' nephew for Vitalian's hope of seizing the throne. Anastasius, already very old in 516, would not be expected to live much longer. Vitalian as a 'semi-barbarian' had plenty of examples from the west of barbarian rulers (e.g. Ricimer). To have killed Hypatius while he had the chance would, however, have destroyed his credibility as a genuine reformer. It is interesting that ultimately he was killed not by any relatives of Anastasius, but by (in theological terms) an ally; cf. Greatrex (1996) 134f.

Further Negotiations with the Pope

After the final defeat of Vitalian at the Golden Horn, Anastasius decided to renew negotiations with the pope, sending as ambassadors Theopompus (*comes domesticorum*) and Severianus (*comes sacri consistorii*) with two letters: one addressed to the pope,³²² the other to the Roman senate.³²³ The pope was offended that the envoys were mere laymen and politicians, rather than the prominent ecclesiastics he had been promised.³²⁴ To Hormisdas, this smacked of insincerity and was proof that the emperor was not serious in his desire to patch up the schism. The contents and sycophantic tone were a further source of displeasure. Anastasius explained that he had sent his legates to give the pope the results of his discussions with bishops about the problems between the churches of the east and west, but the outcome of the talks was never revealed.

The letter to the senate was very different and, indeed, the type of envoys chosen (political rather than ecclesiastical) was more for the benefit of the Roman senators. Anastasius referred to them as "his own senate" (*senatui suo*) and begged them to use their influence to achieve peace in the church: "both with the exalted king to whom the power and responsibility of ruling you is committed, and with the venerable pope, to whom is entrusted the capacity to intercede for you with God".³²⁵ Thus Anastasius cleverly attributed power to rule to the king, but to the pope only the power of intercession. However, the senate no longer had the same sympathy for the east. The intervening years under Symmachus and Hormisdas had seen the demise of the *Henoticon* party, either through the former's intransigence or through the latter's policy of reinstating and therefore assimilating members into the orthodox Roman church. The senate's reply confirmed Hormisdas' demand for the condemnation of Acacius, submission to the Roman see and adhesion to the Council of Chalcedon.

In his response, Hormisdas referred to Anastasius' appeal to the senate: "You have turned to the Senate of Rome that it exhort me to peace ... Listen to me, the representative of Christ".³²⁶ Hormisdas not

³²² Thiel (1868) 764, Gunther (1895–1898) no.111; translated by Coleman-Norton (1966) 961–962, no.547.

³²³ Cf. ch. 4, pp.100–101.

³²⁴ Cf. Gunther (1895–1898) no.137.

³²⁵ *apud excelsam regem, cui regendi vos potestas vel sollicitudo commissa est, quam apud venerabilem papam, cui intercedendi apud deum facultas est praestita*, Thiel (1868) 765 and Gunther (1895–1898) no.113 (tr. Hodgkin (1885) III.471).

³²⁶ *vos senatui urbis Romae, ut me ad pacem hortaretur, iniungitis ... audite me pro Christo legatione fungentem*. (tr. Charanis (1974) 97). Mansi (1762) VIII.398, Thiel (1868) 766,

only verified the position of Rome once again, and confirmed that Acacius and the Council of Chalcedon were "stumbling blocks" to the peace of the church, but also reminded Anastasius of his limited secular *potestas* in comparison to his own ecclesiastical *auctoritas* as Christ's representative on earth.³²⁷ Hormisdas also shared with Avitus his doubts that a compromise could be reached. He wrote thus: "As to the Greeks, they proffer vows of peace with the lips rather than with the heart, and speak more of right than they do".³²⁸ However, in this letter he also mentioned the possibility of sending another embassy to the court of Anastasius. He was perhaps encouraged to do so by his success in the Balkans and especially in the east. He prepared letters for Anastasius (in which he denounced Acacius), for Timothy (concerning his return to orthodoxy), for Dorotheus, the populace of Constantinople and the bishops of the east.³²⁹ He despatched them with two legates, Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia and leader of the embassy of 515, and Peregrinus, bishop of Misenum in Campania, accompanied by the subdeacon Pullio, in April, 517.³³⁰

Anastasius refused to negotiate, and sent the legates back to Italy with orders not to touch at any port, to eliminate the risk of the papal letters being circulated. This attempt of the pope to win over the bishops of the east had enraged the emperor and on 11th July, 517, he wrote back to the pope ending their correspondence: "But from henceforth we shall suppress in silence our requests, thinking it absurd to show the courtesy of prayers to those who, with threats in their mouth, refuse even to be entreated. We can bear insults and contempt, but we cannot permit ourselves to be commanded".³³¹

Jaffé (1885–1888) no.779, Gunther (1895–1898) no.112.

³²⁷ cf. Amory (1997) 210. In general Hormisdas avoided references to secular matters. He pushed for the only logical end to the schism in his view: submission of the east.

³²⁸ *sed quantum ad Graecos, ore potius praeferunt pacis vota quam pectore et loquuntur magis iusta quam faciunt*. Gunther (1895–1898) no.137 (tr. Charanis (1974) 97).

³²⁹ Records of correspondence between the monks of the monastery of St. Maron in Syria and Hormisdas indicate the extent of the active interference of the pope in sensitive areas of the empire; cf. Gray (1979) 43.

³³⁰ Mansi (1762) VIII.412–418, Thiel (1868) 796–806, Jaffé (1885–1888) nos.789–794, Gunther (1895–1898) nos.126–128, with the *Liber Pontificalis* 1.269–270.

³³¹ *sed postulationem nostram a praesenti tempore taciturnitate comprimi<mu>s, irrationalabile iudicantes illis precum adhibere bonitatem, qui rogari se nolint contumaciter respuentes. Iniuriari enim et adnullari sustinere possumus, iuberi non possumus*. Thiel (1868) 813, Gunther (1895–1898) no.138 (tr. Charanis (1974) 105).

Conclusion

Just before the death of Anastasius, Timothy died and John II was appointed in his place. He wasted no time in anathematising the Council of Chalcedon, yet Severus wrote: "As to the man who has just been instituted and holds the prelacy of the royal city, we have learned that he is John ... who is thought to be inclined to the right opinions and holds out some pleasing hopes to the orthodox, but is more desirous of adopting a deceitful middle course".³³²

However, there was no room for a middle course. There was now little possibility of a union between the four eastern patriarchates: the orthodox backlash had been growing since the election of Severus at Antioch, fanned more than anything by the uncompromising attitude of Severus himself, Philoxenus and other staunch monophysites. As a consequence, Severus' election turned out to be the pinnacle of monophysite achievement. To the east (perhaps less concerned with the preservation of Acacius' name than Constantinople), a reconciliation with Rome must have seemed increasingly attractive. In Constantinople, too, the tide was changing. Rioters on 15th and 16th July, 518, shortly after the death of Anastasius, called for the deposition of Severus, the restoration of the relics of Macedonius to the Great Church, affirmation of the Council of Chalcedon and an end to the schism with Rome.

It cannot be denied that this amounted to an overthrow of almost all that Anastasius had worked for. He bequeathed an empire as much in schism as that which he had inherited. Yet he had worked hard to heal the schism with the church of Rome and to resolve the tensions in the east between the Chalcedonians and monophysites. For Anastasius, these objectives were crucial, not just for the sake of doctrinal unity, but for his economic and foreign policies. However, the emperor found that the most ardent and extreme Chalcedonians and monophysites could not be moved by persuasion. He made several attempts to negotiate with successive popes but the sticking point was Acacius and any concession would have earned the disapproval of the patriarch and led to unrest in Constantinople. The settlement that was finally agreed was extremely unfavourable to the east and would not have been accepted at an earlier time.³³³ In the east, Anastasius maintained the *Henoticon* as long as he could. However, with different interpretations of the

Henoticon springing up, it was increasingly difficult to maintain unity based on it. He learnt, at considerable cost, that it was not possible to achieve reconciliation by reverting to the tolerance of the pre-Chalcedonian church. For the Chalcedonians, any solution must now contain reference to the Council of 451 and the Tome of Leo.³³⁴ On the other hand, the subsequent strength of the monophysite leadership rendered any opposition the cause of further instability; even the deposition of the four patriarchs arguably might have led to increased unity within the east.

Ultimately, however, no satisfactory solution to the conflict in the east could be found. Though Justin and Justinian were successful in quickly healing the breach with Rome, their attempts to impose unity among the eastern patriarchates were as unsuccessful as those of Anastasius; and, in fact, the end of Justinian's reign saw the foundation of a separate monophysite (Jacobite) church altogether. The reign of Anastasius, then, forms a chapter in late Roman religious history at a time when relations between the east and the church of Rome were strained by frequent imperial interference in doctrinal matters, and when schisms within the east, unsuccessfully healed by successive church councils, were reaching the point where there would be a decisive split between Chalcedonians and monophysites. Anastasius' handling of the disunity and instability caused by doctrinal differences must be judged in this context.

³³⁴ Cf. Gray (1979) 77.

³³² Sel. Let. VI:1 (and tr. Frend (1972) 233).

³³³ Justinian strove throughout his reign to find a way of making Chalcedon and the Tome acceptable to the monophysites, but failed to find a formula which was any more successful than the *Henoticon*; cf. Gray (1979) 78.

6

ADMINISTRATION AND
DOMESTIC POLICY

If Anastasius faced criticism in his handling of doctrinal disunity, he has almost universally been praised for his successful rehabilitation of the state economy. At his accession, the empire was on the brink of bankruptcy following Leo I's disastrous expedition against the Vandals in 468 and the instability and high expenditure of Zeno's rule;¹ at his death in 518, the imperial treasury held three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of gold.² His successor, Justin, attributed this remarkable saving to *parca subtilitas* (economical ingenuity),³ yet Anastasius managed to implement a number of tax cuts, as well as providing subsidies for regions suffering from bad harvests, war and earthquake damage. He understood the links between a proficient and fair system of taxation which would lead to a well-resourced army and to an efficient, productive and secure empire. The key to Anastasius' success lay in a much wider reorganisation of the empire's resources and how they were managed. He therefore not only provided for a restructuring of the fisc, but also catered for the consequences, by introducing changes to the collection of taxes, to both municipal administration and agrarian legislation, and to the organisation of the army.

¹ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.45; Bury (1923) I.401.

² Proc. *Anec.* XIX.7. Stein (1949) II.193 compares the wealth of the empire under Anastasius to that under Basil II, who in 1025 left two hundred thousand pounds in the state treasury (according to Zonaras XVII.8.23). Basil had ruled an extensive empire which had enjoyed a century of prosperity. See also Treadgold (1995) 193–194 who records the surplus in the treasury at the death of various emperors, from Marcian (457) up to Basil II. Gordon (1959) 25 noted that Anastasius must have saved an average of almost twelve thousand pounds of gold annually, and puts his annual income at at least two hundred and fifty thousand pounds of gold, using the analogy of modern budgets (e.g. Britain 1900–1905 and post-war Canada) where budgetary surpluses never exceed 5%; cf. Williams and Friell (1999) 131ff who calculate an average surplus of one million *solidi* over standard expenditure per annum, and a total revenue of at least nine million *solidi*, making the reign of Anastasius the “greatest period of success”; cf. Williams and Friell (1999) 140.

³ C.J. II.7.25; Jones (1964) I.236.

Overview of the economy and administration
of the later Roman Empire

The economy in the late Roman Empire was in many ways not dissimilar to ancient Roman economy. The empire depended on the land for its revenues which were expended, to a large extent, on the army.⁴ Coinage was produced primarily to assist in this transfer of revenue, and therefore as a political or military tool, rather than for commercial or strictly economic purposes.⁵ In the west, the influx of barbarians caused a decrease in the land available for taxation, while the disruption of war, the displacement of the Roman population and the transfer of land to the new barbarian settlers resulted in the interruption of revenues coming from the land. However, while it may have become apparent that the land was increasingly overburdened, the state did little to alter the existing system of collecting revenues. Constantine had introduced a tax on senatorial wealth (*collatio glebalis*) and on commerce (*collatio lustralis* or *chrysargyron*), but apart from the oft-repeated legislation aimed at helping landlords to retain their tenants (*coloni*) by tying them to the land,⁶ there was little to help the poorer landowners cope with the burden. In practice, too, senators were often exempted from taxation, and eventually the *collatio glebalis* was abolished by Marcian. In 498, Anastasius followed suit with the abolition of the *chrysargyron*.⁷

During the third century, supplies for the army (the *annona*) were collected in kind.⁸ In theory, accurate calculation should have allowed for the exact amount from each province to be determined and for

⁴ Cf. Lemerle (1979) 7, Hendy (1985) 157. On land as the basis of the economy; e.g. Hendy (1989) I.4ff. The army and attendant bureaucracy accounted for between 50% and 75% of the state budget; Hendy (1989) I.17. On the importance of the army, Brandes and Haldon (2000) 159–160. On the imperial budget, see especially Hendy (1985) 164ff.

⁵ Cf. Hendy (1989) I.18, V.137, Cameron (1993b) 95, Hahn (2000) 7ff.

⁶ E.g. C.J. XI.51.1; cf. Cameron (1993b) 85–88 on the organisation of labour.

⁷ On the huge wealth of senators, Hendy (1989) I.11–12; on the *collatio glebalis*, see Jones (1964) I.431 with n.51, III.106–108, and for its abolition, C.J. XII.2.2; on the *chrysargyron*, see discussion below.

⁸ The *annona* consisted of rations of bread, meat, wine and oil for soldiers, plus a fodder allowance (*capitus*) for cavalrymen. The grain requisition for Rome (from North Africa) and Constantinople (from Egypt) was also collected in kind; cf. Geiss (1931) 4ff, Segré (1942–1943), Jones (1964) 1.691–705, Lemerle (1979) *passim*, Cameron (1993b) 99–100, 215, n.39. The depreciation of coinage during the ‘third-century crisis’ caused the transfer to a fiscal system based on assessment and expenditure in kind. This process was well under way by the reign of Aurelian, and by the time of Diocletian, little tax was collected in coin; cf. Hendy (1985) 372, Williams and Friell (1999) 204.

reductions to be made when possible. However, the land and population registers often became outdated and great discrepancies between provinces arose. After the third century, taxation in kind began to be commuted into gold (pounds or *solidi*). This change in method of payment (the *adaeratio*) began in the west, and continued sporadically in the east, until Anastasius completed the process.⁹ The commutation may have stemmed partly from the changes in the organisation of the army introduced by Constantine, who created a large mobile field army in two divisions commanded by the *magistri peditum* and the *magistri equitum*. Later, the field army was divided into regional groups (*comitatenses*). While this policy had the effect of increasing numbers and therefore the financial burden, it also meant that soldiers were no longer stationed on the frontiers, but were often billeted near towns and thus close to supplies.¹⁰ However, there were still occasions when the state needed to provide supplies direct to the army. These were furnished by the practice of *coemptio* (the usually compulsory purchase of produce) which could become a permanent surtax. Anastasius forbade *coemptio* (except in Thrace).¹¹ The advantages of this commutation were manifest: it meant that the problems of collection, distribution and costly transport were no longer an issue and it allowed the state to amass a reserve of gold and silver.¹²

However, taxation in coin had always been problematic because of the instability of the currency. Based on a tri-metal system, there was no fixed exchange rate between gold, silver and bronze.¹³ Constantine introduced the gold *solidus* (struck at seventy-two to the pound), which remained stable; but silver coinage, after its debasement in the third century, always remained weak, as did bronze, minted in tiny denominations (*nummi* or *folles*) whose value fluctuated against the *solidus*. Inflation soared since large numbers of these bronze coins were minted but not recovered by taxation as payment was to be made

in gold coin.¹⁴ Eventually, Anastasius sought to bring the situation under control with his reforms of the bronze currency in 498 and 512.

The importance placed by the state on a currency based on precious metals rather than bronze, was reflected by the trend in the limitations imposed on the minting of gold coins. From the fourth century, gold and silver coins were produced increasingly less frequently at the regional mints. During the years 366–369, Valens and Valentinian legislated that gold collected in taxation could be melted down locally, but might be recoined only by the imperial mint (the comitatensian *officium* of the *comes sacrarum largitionum*) and further, that no private gold should be coined at the imperial mints. This meant, therefore, that only the imperial mint could coin gold and that only tax-derived gold could be coined.¹⁵ The different attitude displayed to the coining of gold may be indicated by the fact that the comitatensian mint and the *moneta publica* (producing bronze coins) were separate institutions located in different places in Constantinople.¹⁶

As the security of the empire depended on the military, and the sustaining of the military depended on the efficient collection of taxes, it was imperative that the land should be farmed as productively as possible and that there should be a capable infrastructure to support the collection and redistribution of revenue. Previously, taxes in the provinces were collected by the *curiales*, the provincial civic leaders. After the 'third-century crisis', however, the *curiales* lost property and status and the duty of tax collection became a burden they were no longer willing or able to sustain. This resulted from two changes: their loss of personal property which made them less able to afford to finance acts of benefaction to the city, such as the construction of prestige buildings; and secondly, from the mid-fourth century, the state exercised a far greater control of civic estates and their revenues which

⁹ The *adaeratio* was very popular. Payment in gold had always been considered a privilege; Karayannopoulos (1956) 75f, *CAH* IX.194–5. On Anastasius and the *adaeratio*, see below, pp.200–202.

¹⁰ On the changes in the army, Hendy (1989) I.17. The new policy brought both advantages and disadvantages. While there were many complaints from the locals about the behaviour of the soldiers, in some cases the presence of the army may have in fact stimulated the economy; cf. Cameron (1993b) 96–96, *CAH* IX.194–5.

¹¹ For the history of the *coemptio*, Karayannopoulos (1956) 78; *CAH* XIV.197, n.150. See below, pp.199–200.

¹² Cf. Hendy (1989) I.17; the *adaeratio* was particularly beneficial to the praetorian prefecture, the bureau responsible for the collection of this tax.

¹³ Cf. Hahn (2000) 11. For details on the debasement of coinage in the third century, see e.g. Hendy (1984) 448ff, and the consequences, Hahn (2000) 13.

¹⁴ Change was given in bronze coin; Hendy (1989) VIII.13, and more bronze coins were introduced into circulation as the state bought gold from the money-changers in exchange for bronze; Cameron (1993a) 116. Money changers (*τραπεζίται*, *collectarii*) and silversmiths (*ἀργυροπράται*, *argentarii*) were involved in many transactions, including the payment of taxes.

¹⁵ *C.Th.* IX.21.7; On the reforms of Valens and Valentinian, see Kent (1956) 199–200, Hendy (1989) I.20, V.125, VIII.141–142 notes 59–64. On the distinction between the production of gold, silver and bronze, Hendy (1985) 386ff.

¹⁶ Details and further discussion, Kent (1956) 201, Hendy (1989) V.131ff, VI.6ff, Hahn (2000) 5–7. Silver for special occasions or with a medallic function would have been produced at the comitatensian mint; regular issues of silver would have been coined at the *moneta publica*, although as silver coinage had virtually disappeared by the beginning of the fifth century, there was effectively a polarisation between metals and mints.

had previously been entirely entrusted to the *curiales*.¹⁷ Despite the comparative decline in the richness of the provincial cities, the imperial government still relied on the collection of tax and so it was essential to ensure that civic revenues were collected efficiently. During the reign of Anastasius, the tax collecting duties of the decurions were supervised by the *vindices*.¹⁸ But it was not only in the financial sphere that the duties of the *curiales* were curtailed. Their administrative role was also reduced. From the fourth century new municipal officers were created or increased in importance. These included the positions of *curator* (λογιστής), who controlled the city's expenditure, and that of *defensor* (ἐκδικος), whose job it was to protect the rights of citizens against official aggression. These officials worked alongside the town council, but were accountable to the provincial governor (or prefect of Egypt).¹⁹ At the beginning of the fifth century, the growing importance of the position of the bishop in the local community and the place of the Church in secular affairs was recognised formally with the inclusion of the bishop and clergy on a committee to appoint the *defensor* and *sitona*.²⁰ Eventually, the *curiales* would be replaced by a new oligarchy; the notables.²¹

At imperial level, there were two departments (the palatine ministries) dealing with the collection and organisation of revenues. They were headed by members of the *comitatus* (the emperor's personal entourage): the *comes sacrarum largitionum* (the count of the sacred largesses) and the *comes rerum privatarum* (count of the private estates). The former collected tax in gold, silver or textiles and arranged the payment of the army, either in coin or in uniforms and equipment. These taxes, collected every four or five years, were related to the accessional (paid in gold) and quinquennial (paid in silver)

donatives, which were now considered a regular part of army pay.²² The *comes sacrarum largitionum* was also responsible for the customs offices, mines, some state factories, and importantly, the organisation of the production of coinage.²³ He was supported by a huge administration; at the imperial court, he headed ten sub-departments (*scrinia*) and in the diocesan provinces, there was an administrator with a large support staff. The *comes rerum privatarum*, on the other hand, administered all intestate property, and estates which had been confiscated, left to the emperor in bequests, or simply abandoned. He was supported by five *scrinia* at the imperial court, as well as by administrators at diocesan and provincial level and officials controlling estates.²⁴

Over time, the praetorian prefects began to play an increasingly important role in the running of the fisc through their role in furnishing supplies to the army.²⁵ They were responsible for drawing up the annual budget for the empire, having calculated the amount of taxes required to cover the needs of the army. This gave them effective control over systems of taxation and communications (the roads and *cursus publicus*, public post) and they supervised the diocesan vicars, provincial governors and town councils. They began to control not only military supplies, but food rations to the cities.²⁶ The basic tax exacted

²² It is instructive to note that the only tax levied at this frequency (every four/five years) was the *chrysargyron* (*collatio lustralis*) which was imposed on urban artisans/tradesmen etc; cf. Hendy (1985) 646–647, Hendy (1989) I.16. Hendy (1985) 175f also notes, in connection with these donatives, the *aurum coronarium*, a theoretically voluntary offering imposed on the curial class and the *aurum oblativum*, a similar tax levied on the senatorial class. On the worth of these donatives, see further Hendy (1989) I.17–18.

Treadgold (1995) 153–157 notes that there is no record of the quinquennial donative after 511, and argues that from 516 Anastasius offered one *solidus* per annum, instead of five *solidi* every five years. Since the major source of funding for the donative was no longer forthcoming, the argument for the conversion of pay is not implausible. Moreover, as military pay was being restructured after the commutation of the *annona* to a cash payment, it is not improbable that Anastasius was responsible for both changes. However, it should be noted that there is no direct evidence attributing this restructuring to Anastasius; Proc. *Anec.* XXIV.27–29 attributes the measure to Justinian; cf. Jones (1964) II.670, Delmaire (1989) 270, CAH XIV, 291. On both imperial donatives and tribute to foreign powers, especially in comparison with the expenditure of other emperors, see Illuk (1985) 90ff.

²³ For a discussion on the organisation of the *officium* of the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, see Hendy (1989) VI.1ff, with references to his *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy* (1985), and (1989) VIII.137ff.

²⁴ Cf. Hendy (1989) I.16; CAH XIV.171.

²⁵ On the praetorian prefecture and staff, Jones (1964) I.448–558, Hendy (1989) VIII.131–133, CAH XIV.174f. Under Anastasius, there were two prefectures: one based in Thessalonika and the other (more important) in Constantinople.

²⁶ CAH XIV.174, n.43 for references.

¹⁷ For details, Liebeschuetz (2001) ch.5, esp. sections 2 and 3. After various intermediary stages, the income from the rent for the civic estates was roughly divided, giving two thirds to the empire, one third to the city. The city might regain lands — for example, those confiscated from decurions who chose to leave the city council — but they did not make up for the lands no longer under civic ownership. Civic lands were also liable to be granted to individuals by the state, thus resulting in further loss of income to the city; cf. Liebeschuetz (2001) 178.

¹⁸ On the later financial responsibility of the οἶκοι (houses), see Liebeschuetz (2001) 181–198.

¹⁹ Cf. Liebeschuetz (2001) 199. On the terminology of *curator* and the title πατήρ τῆς πόλεως in the fifth and sixth centuries, see Roueché (1979) and Sijpesteijn (1987).

²⁰ The *sitona* was the corn buyer who was to purchase corn at public expense and sell it at a price affordable to the poor.

²¹ Much has been written recently on the changing face of the classical city; see, for example, Laniado (2002), Liebeschuetz (2001) especially chapter 13 for an overview, and Alston (2002). On the notables, see CAH XIV, 219–222.

was the *indictio*, levied on the land (*iuga*) and the agricultural population (*capita*). Diocletian made provision for regular empire-wide censuses which formed the basis for the fifteen-year indictional dating cycle. However, the census was rarely held on time and therefore calculations of tax were consequently inaccurate. As the tax was calculated by the praetorian prefecture based on the annual demands of the army, the rate was variable, though it was noted that while it often rose, it was rarely reduced.²⁷ The commutation of the land tax into gold meant that the praetorian prefecture now controlled the majority of monetary resources and became far more powerful than the *res privata* and *sacrae largitiones*. It may not be a coincidence that the prefecture gained most in importance during the reigns of Anastasius and Justinian when it was headed by capable and experienced officials.²⁸

The Court and Imperial Officials²⁹

When Anastasius turned his attention to the economy and to the overhaul of the tax system after the end of the Isaurian war in 498, he sought to appoint a team of learned and cultured officers who brought with them a wealth of practical experience and insight into the workings of the imperial *scrinia*.³⁰ Himself a civil servant, promoted from the ranks of the *silentiarii*, Anastasius understood the value of proficient training in a government bureau.³¹ He rejected those whose only qualification was their *illustris* birth. For example, he refused a request of Ariadne to promote Anthemius, son of the western emperor Anthemius (467–472), to the praetorian prefecture, alluding to the intellectual qualities required for the job.³² The importance of selecting

carefully officials in the highest echelons of government was paramount. Ministers could influence or even direct the drafting of laws; and the question of the relative authority of the emperor as opposed to the actual authority wielded by his officials may be demonstrated to some extent in the abolition of the *chrysargyon*. Initially, Anastasius held a public bonfire of the tax registers in the hippodrome, but his later pretence that he had decided to reinstate the tax resulted in the finance officers of the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* revealing a mass of paperwork they had not yet destroyed, thus showing that the emperor's power could depend on the will of his officials to carry out orders.³³

Polycarp, a native of Beirut, had been promoted to the praetorian prefecture from his post as *scriniarius* (financial clerk) in the civil service.³⁴ Others were similarly experienced. Leontius held the prefecture in 510. He had been the professor of law at Beirut, and was later involved in the compilation of the *Codex Justinianus*.³⁵ Two other prefects, Zoticus (511–512), from Philadelphia in Lydia, and Sergius (517) were both men of literary talent and Sergius had also had experience as an advocate in the court of the praetorian prefect.³⁶ The best-known praetorian prefect under Anastasius was undoubtedly Marinus from Apamea. He began his career in Constantinople in the *scrinium orientis*, taking over as *tractator* from John the Paphlagonian and eventually becoming Anastasius' chief financial minister.³⁷ In this role, he was responsible for many economic and administrative changes (for example, the introduction of *vindices*), and his influence over the emperor was said to be considerable. In the face of extreme criticism from John the Lydian it is difficult to gain a true picture of the contribution Marinus made to the reign of Anastasius, but it is clear that he played a significant role in the formulation of the new administrative

²⁷ Cf. Hendy (1989) I.115–116.

²⁸ Polycarp and Marinus under Anastasius; John the Cappadocian and Peter Barsymes under Justinian; cf. *CAH* XIV.196; see also Hendy (1985) 372.

²⁹ See appendix D for a list of officials and legislation passed during Anastasius' reign.

³⁰ Cf. *Proc. Pan.* 30.

³¹ Silentaries were part of the palace staff and numbered thirty. They were under the command of three decurions and overall under the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*. They served as ushers at the palace at meetings of the consistory, and were often sent on missions, especially on Church business. They might also serve the empress; for example, Ariadne was served by four silentaries (including Anastasius). They gained high official status, and by 437 silentaries who retired after thirteen years' service were admitted to the senate. In the sixth century, decurions retired with the title *comes domesticorum inter agentes* or *magister officiorum* and silentaries became honorary *illustres*. See further, Jones (1964) II.571–572, II.1234, n.15.

³² John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.50, Capizzi (1969) 140–141, n.186. See John of Ant. fr.214c for notice of Anthemius' promotion to the consulship in 515.

³³ Cf. *CAH* XIV.193; and see below on the *chrysargyon*.

³⁴ *Zach. Vit. Sev.*, PO. 2.59–60, 65; *C.J.* V.30.4; *PLRE* II.895f; Chauvot (1986) 139 for further details.

³⁵ On legal training as an important qualification for the praetorian prefecture which involved the administration of justice, Jones (1964) I.387.

³⁶ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.17, with *PLRE* II.672–673, Leontius 23; John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.26 on Zoticus, with *PLRE* II.1206–1207; *PLRE* II.994–995, Sergius 7.

³⁷ Mal. 400 records that John held the post of *tractator* and *logothetes*, while Zachariah VII.9 uses the term *chartularius*; see Stein (1949) II.204f, n.2 for a discussion on the discrepancy. The *scrinium orientis* was the financial department of the praetorian prefect responsible for the Oriental diocese. The post of *scriniarius* (tax accountant) was scorned by the civil service as it did not require the same level of classical education; and it was this which may have contributed to the dislike John the Lydian (proud of his classical education) held towards Marinus. Undoubtedly this position had provided Marinus with useful practical experience of the fisc and the system of tax collection.

structure of the empire.³⁸ John the Paphlagonian also flourished. Building on his experience as a *tractator* he was appointed *comes sacrarum largitionum* in 498 when he piloted the first step of the bronze currency reform, and he rose to be an honorary consul.³⁹ Anastasius also tried to ensure that those elevated with the title honorary consul were deserving cases. Zeno had decreed that the title should be automatically bestowed on the payment of a *centenarium* of gold to the aqueduct fund at Constantinople.⁴⁰ Those appointed by Anastasius had all held other important state offices or military commands.⁴¹

In his panegyric, Priscian praises Anastasius for his appointment of men of learning and culture:

nec non eloquio decoratos, maxime princeps,
quos doctrina potens et sudor musicus auget,
quorum Romanas munit sapientia leges,
adsumis socios iusto moderamine rerum;
et solus doctis das praemia digna labore,
muneribus ditans et pascens mente benigna.

Mighty Princes, you also chose as your associates in just government those distinguished for their eloquence who are embellished by the power of learning and the exercise of poetry, those whose wisdom protects the Roman laws. You alone grant to learned men deserved rewards for their labours, endow them with gifts and support them with your generous heart. (Prisc. *Pan.* 248–253, tr. Coyne)

Even generals were selected for such attributes. Celer, the *magister officiorum*, from 503 to 518, and consul in 508, was described as “a man filled with God’s grace as well as good sense and learning of every kind, ■ brave man”.⁴² It should be noted that Celer was rewarded

³⁸ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.49.

³⁹ *PLRE* II.604–605, no.45. John’s monetary reform will be discussed in detail below, pp.202ff. On the duties of ■ *tractator*, Jones (1964) I.450–451, II.1186–1187, n.96. Another well-known *comes sacrarum largitionum* was Fl. Taurus Clementinus Armonius Clementinus, though it is not certain when he held this post. He became an ordinary consul in 513, having already been an honorary consul sometime before 511; *PLRE* II.303.

⁴⁰ Cf. Jones (1964) II.533.

⁴¹ E.g. Apion, a member of the prominent Egyptian family. He was highly regarded by Anastasius who appointed him *hyparch* (ἐπαρχος), in charge of provisions for the Roman army at Edessa. He also held the titular rank of praetorian prefect; see Mal. 398, Josh. 54, Hardy (1931) 25 and on the identity of this Apion, Bury (1923) I.470f, Stein (1949) II.782, *PLRE* II.111–112, no.2, Greatrex (1996) 128. Other honorary consuls included John the Paphlagonian, Areobindus (Greatrex (1996) 127–128 cf. above, ch. 3, p.58), and John, son of Valeriana (*PLRE* II.608, John 60; John of Ant. fr.214e).

⁴² ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ μετὰ λόγου καὶ παιδείας πάσης χάριτος θεοῦ πολλῆς πεπληρωμένος καὶ ἀνδρείος, Theoph. AM 5998 (tr. Mango and Scott). Mal. 399, calls him learned. Celer’s predecessor, Eusebius (*magister officiorum* 492–497), was considered worthy to hold the consulship twice, once under Zeno, and again in 493; *PLRE* II.433, no.28.

with the consulship after bringing the Persian war to a satisfactory conclusion in 505/506. Similarly, John the Scythian and John the Hunchback, the successful generals of the Isaurian war, were given consulships in 498 and 499 respectively, in recognition of their achievement in eventually outmanoeuvring the guerrilla tactics of the rebels.⁴³

On occasions, Anastasius reserved the consulship for himself and his family.⁴⁴ The consular *fasti* reveal that he held this office three times (492, 497 and 507) and his three nephews, Hypatius,⁴⁵ Pompeius and Probus,⁴⁶ held it in successive years, 500, 501 and 502. His brother, Paul, was in office in 496 and his brother-in-law, Secundinus, in 511.⁴⁷ Two further relations, Flavius Anastasius Paulus Probus Sabinianus Pompeius Anastasius and Flavius Anastasius Paulus Probus Moschianus Probus Magnus, held the consulship in 517 and 518 respectively.⁴⁸ However, although the consulship was said to be the only ancient republican office to retain its glamour, it did not carry the same degree of power and prestige as it had during the Republic and early empire and did not survive Justinian’s reign.⁴⁹

Financial Reforms

The year 498, at the cessation of hostilities against the Isaurians, appears to be when Anastasius launched a number of measures designed to help the economy back on its feet. This was the year in which

⁴³ Cf. ch. 2, p.26.

⁴⁴ Cameron (1978) 260 comments that Anastasius and members of his family held the consulship so often, thus concentrating state power in the imperial family, that the emperor might have hoped to establish his own dynasty easily. On this point, see also Bréhier (1914) col.1449 and Capizzi (1969) 44.

⁴⁵ Hypatius went on to become the *magister militum praesentalis* (503 and 513); *PLRE* II.577–581, Hypatius 6.

⁴⁶ On Probus and Pompeius, Greatrex (1996) 129–131.

⁴⁷ Secundinus had been city prefect in 492; *PLRE* II.986, Secundinus 5.

⁴⁸ For further discussion on the identity of the last two, see Cameron (1978) 259–260, who believes they are the great-nephews of Paul, Anastasius’ brother, contra *PLRE* II.82–83, no.17 and II.701, no.5 and Capizzi (1969) 42 who both think they are the sons of Anastasius’ nephews, Pompeius and Probus. Interestingly, Anastasius did not penalise the religious sympathies of any of his family members by denying them consulship. Pompeius was certainly Chalcedonian orthodox; see Theod. Lect. 505; *PLRE* II.898, no.2. Moreover, the careful observance of seniority by Anastasius should be noted; his brother first held the consulship, then his three nephews, and lastly, Secundinus (not of imperial blood).

⁴⁹ The last western consul was Paulinus, appointed by Amalasuntha in 534. In the east, Flavius Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius was the last non-imperial incumbent and thereafter it was held only by emperors; cf. Jones (1964) II.532–3.

the two most powerful financial institutions, the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* and the praetorian prefecture, were headed by two capable and professional men, John the Paphlagonian and Polycarp.⁵⁰ With their previous experience they would have been in a good position to take an overview of the balance of collecting and expenditure of revenue, and ensure that empire's wealth was being taxed efficiently.

The Chrysargyron

One of the first measures was the abolition of the *chrysargyron* or *auri lustralis collatio*.⁵¹ As noted above, the tax had been introduced by Constantine the Great and appears in the Theodosian Code.⁵² It was regulated by successive emperors who made various changes as to how it was collected and who was liable. Originally levied in gold and silver every five years, from the reign of Valentinian and Valens it was collected in gold, and from the fifth century, every four years.⁵³ The tax targeted *negotiatores*,⁵⁴ with certain categories of exemptions which were forever changing: the main groups to be exempt were doctors, teachers, landowners and rural craftsmen. Veterans and the clergy

⁵⁰ As discussed above, pp. 191–192.

⁵¹ C.J. XI.1.1–2. The abolition is mentioned in many of the sources covering Anastasius' reign; Mal. 398, Josh. 31, Prisc. Pan. 149–161, Proc. Pan. 13, Theod. Lect. 553, Evag. III.39, Cyril of Scythop. Vit. Sab. LIV, Theoph. AM 5993, Cedr. 627, Zon. XIV.3.11, Niceph. Cal. XVI.40. The correct date of the reform is given by Joshua and Cyril of Scythopolis; contra Malalas who places it after Anastasius' third consulship in 507, Theophanes who dates it to ten years after Anastasius' accession (501), and Cedrenus who puts it in the first year of Anastasius' reign (perhaps because of its importance). Cyril of Scythopolis, who records that the reform took place thirteen years before Sabas' visit to the capital in 511 (thus 498) confuses Delmaire (1989) 371 who dates that visit to 512 and therefore calculates wrongly the dating of the *chrysargyron* abolition. Lécivain (1903) 334 is surely mistaken in doubting that Anastasius carried out the reform. The reference to the *auri lustralis collatio* in Justinian's *Novel XLIII*, refers to a tax on buildings; see Stein (1917) 578ff and Delmaire (1989) 371ff.

⁵² There is some suggestion that the *chrysargyron* had been created by the emperor Alexander Severus; see Bréhier (1914) col. 1450 and Capizzi (1969) 143–144, n. 202. However, the confusion seems to arise from the refutation of Zosimus II.38 (who says it was instigated by Constantine) by Evagrius III.40 (and Niceph. Cal. XVI.40–41). It is more likely that the rhetorical invective of Evagrius is misleading and that Constantine was responsible; Chauvot (1986) 148, Karayannopoulos (1958) 129 and Jones (1964) I.431.

⁵³ Much has been written on the history of the *chrysargyron*; see Seeck (1901a) 370ff, Karayannopoulos (1958) 130–133, Delmaire (1989), Bagnall (1992). See Jones (1966) 154 on how it was exacted (firstly by councils, and then transferred by Julian to the trade guilds of each city who elected their own officials to collect it). Chauvot (1986) 148–154, has details on the origins, categories affected, and treatment by Procopius and Priscian.

⁵⁴ Jones (1964) I.431. *Negotiatores* were those who made a living by buying, selling, or charging fees.

enjoyed various degrees of immunity. At the beginning of the sixth century, Procopius of Gaza enumerated five different groups which were affected: artisans, market-gardeners, fishermen, merchants and prostitutes.⁵⁵

The amounts yielded by the *chrysargyron* are not easy to calculate, especially as contemporary sources tend to dwell on the misery caused and the relief at its abolition. Zosimus claimed that the tax was so high that fathers were forced to sell their children into prostitution to raise enough money to meet the demand, while Evagrius rhetorically declared that he needed the eloquence of Thucydides to write about such a law.⁵⁶ Joshua Stylites wrote on the relief at Edessa:

... and the whole city rejoiced (at its remission). They all dressed up in white, from the greatest to the least, and carrying lighted candles and burning censers, to the accompaniment of psalms and hymns, they went out to the *martyrion* of Mar Sergius and Mar Simeon, thanking God and praising the emperor. There they held a eucharist, and on coming back into the city they extended the feast of joy and pleasure for a whole week, and decreed that they would celebrate this feast every year.⁵⁷

The Edessans had been paying one hundred and forty pounds of gold (or just over ten thousand *solidi*) on average every four years. It has been calculated that as there were about fifteen cities in the East equal in importance to Edessa, and over nine hundred towns and cities in total subject to the tax, the *chrysargyron* must have yielded tens of thousands of pounds of gold.⁵⁸ This no doubt accounts for the resistance of the finance officers of the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum*, the bureau responsible for its collection, at a time when the praetorian prefecture was gaining the ascendancy.⁵⁹ On the other hand, the annual

⁵⁵ Proc. Pan. 13, Seeck, (1901a) 373ff, Jones (1964) I.431–432 with n. 52, III.108, Chauvot (1986) 150ff.

⁵⁶ Zos. II.38; Evag. III.39. Such a popular tax reform provided an excellent subject for the panegyrists. Procopius gives a detailed account of the effects of the tax, dwelling on the misery and hardships it caused. The emperor is compared to Peisistratus, the great Athenian reformer, and with Hercules, to emphasise the heroic nature of the act. Priscian focuses on the economic benefits: "these [impious edicts] the father and lord of the earth destroyed forever and relieved the world from the burden of silver and gold" (*quae pater et dominus terrae deleuit in aevum / argenti relevans atque auri pondere mundum*) Prisc. Pan. 152–153 (tr. Coyne).

⁵⁷ Josh. 31 (tr. Trombley and Watt). Further discussion on Edessa in Duval (1891) 423, Trombley and Watt (2000) 30, with notes 144–145.

⁵⁸ Delmaire (1989) 371ff.

⁵⁹ There is some dispute over to whom the tax was paid. While Evag. III.39 indicates the *praetorian prefecture*, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that it went to the imperial *largitiones*, C.J. XI.1.1, Mal. 398, (ταῖς θεαῖς λαργιτιῶσι) and Proc. Pan. 13, (ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως θησαυρός); Jones (1964) III.109, n. 53.

land tax figures for Heracleopolis show a far higher rate; eight hundred pounds of gold.⁶⁰ As Edessa was an important town on the trade route and Heracleopolis a rural provincial area, Jones suggests from the figures above that agriculture produced twenty times as much revenue as trade and industry. From these calculations then, it would seem that the actual amount of revenue the *chrysargyron* yielded was small in comparison to the state budget as a whole, but it was harsh for those who had to bear the burden of it, and a loss to the officers of the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* who had no doubt benefited personally from its collection.⁶¹

According to Cedrenus, Anastasius abolished the *chrysargyron* after the hardships of the tax had been brought to his attention by a deputation of monks from Jerusalem led by Timothy of Gaza, who later wrote a drama on the affair.⁶² It is probable that Anastasius played on popular reaction with the public burning of the tax registers in the hippodrome (see above, p.191), although he did eventually ensure that all records were destroyed properly.⁶³ He was commended by the church which saw the cancellation of the tax as a moral triumph: as payment had been demanded from prostitutes, it had seemed to implicitly recognise prostitution as legal.⁶⁴ But these are hardly likely to have been the only considerations behind the reform. On the other hand, it is unlikely to be true that the main classes taxed (the merchants and artisans) had simply declined and died out by the reign of Anastasius.⁶⁵ Indeed, it has been argued that Anastasius cancelled the tax to allow the merchants and artisans to flourish and create an environment in which trade and industry could prosper.⁶⁶ As suggested above, it might also be the second stage of Marcian's reform which revoked the similarly unpopular gold tax on senators, the *collatio glebalis*.⁶⁷ As a result, the abolition of both these gold taxes meant that land became,

once again, almost the sole provider of taxable wealth for the state.⁶⁸

From a study of the other early Anastasian reforms, it is clear that there were a number of measures introduced to compensate for the loss of revenue.⁶⁹ Firstly, the deficit was directly balanced by a contribution from the *res privata*. Secondly, the completion of the *adaeratio* meant that there was a greater increase in the amount of gold coinage in circulation. Thirdly, and linked to the previous point, the bronze coinage was reformed, also in 498, thus strengthening the currency of all denominations.

The Res Privata and Patrimonium

Evidence from Malalas suggests that the deficit was balanced by a contribution from the *res privata*:

The emperor remitted by sacred decree the whole of the recurrent tax known as the *chrysargyron* and in its place he provided revenue for the Sacred Largesse from his own funds. This was a great and tremendous example of his munificence.⁷⁰

The *res privata* was a financial department founded by Septimius Severus to manage both his personal property (originally his *patrimonium*) and confiscated estates. The department had its own staff and was headed by the *comes rei privatae*. Over time, the emperors began to add to their *patrimonium* lands which had previously passed to the *sacrae largitiones*, including *bona proscriptorum vel damnatorum*, *bona vacantia et caduca*, temple property, municipal estates, legacies and the confiscated property of heretics, pagans, and other criminals.⁷¹ The rents from these lands went toward the maintenance of the *sacrum cubiculum* (the personal household of the emperor) but profits, and the lands themselves, were otherwise at the disposal of the emperor to

⁶⁰ *P. Oxy.* 1909; Jones (1974) 36, Hendy (1985) 174.

⁶¹ Cf. Jones (1974) 36, plus Jones (1964) II.871–872 followed by Hendy (1985) 157 and (1989) I.16 for the figure of 95% of taxation from the land, 5% from trade; contra Delmaire (1989) 371, who thinks the tax would have made a significant difference to the state income.

⁶² Cedr. 627.

⁶³ The abolition of the *chrysargyron* has often been seen as a great measure of Anastasius' generosity, his one action which almost redeemed his good name from the taint of heresy; cf. Jones (1966) 269.

⁶⁴ Evag. III.39 wrote that the tax was "vile and hateful to God".

⁶⁵ F. Thirbault, 'Les impôts directs sous le Bas-Empire romain', *Revue Générale de Droit* 23 (1899) 289–321 and 481–518, and 24 (1900) 32–53 and 112–13; contra Karayannopoulos (1958) 136.

⁶⁶ Ostrogorsky (1956) 65, Karayannopoulos (1958) 136–137.

⁶⁷ Karayannopoulos (1958) 136–137.

⁶⁸ It may be that some taxes on commerce continued. In Egypt, a tax on trades continued up to the Arab period, though in later times the term *chrysargyron* is no longer used. There are several examples of certain groups being taxed, including a tax in gold assessed by streets or quarters in Arsinoe, which sounds suspiciously similar to the *chrysargyron* though payments were made individually and not through guilds. For further discussion, see Johnson and West (1967) 320.

⁶⁹ *CAH IX*.193 notes that the empire's finances were now healthy enough to do without the relatively small return, possibly true after the profits of the Isaurian war; see below, p.198.

⁷⁰ ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐκούφισε τὴν λειτουργίαν τοῦ λεγομένου χρυσαργύρου πᾶσαν διαιωνίζουσαν ἀπὸ θείου τύπου. ἥτις ἐστὶ μεγάλη καὶ φοβερὰ φιλοτιμία, ἀντεισάξας ταῖς θείαις λαργιτικαῖς πρόσδοτον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ. Mal. 398 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott).

⁷¹ Monks (1957) 749ff, Jones (1964) I.411–427, Haldon (1990) 173ff and Kaplan (1992) 149ff.

distribute in free gifts to his family, friends and supporters and in donations to institutions such as the Church.⁷² Leo and Zeno had prioritised the private nature of the fund by dividing it equally between themselves and their empresses.

It appears that Anastasius created (or recreated) the ministry of the *patrimonium* under the leadership of the *comes sacri patrimonii* whose function was to administer the private property allocated to the public treasury.⁷³ Lands and their profits were moved from the *res privata* to the management of the new ministry and from here funds were transferred to the *sacrae largitiones* to make good the deficit caused by the loss of the *chrysargyron*.⁷⁴ The remaining funds of the *res privata* continued to be at Anastasius' disposal, though he did abolish the distinction between separate funds for the emperor and empress.⁷⁵

There are no guidelines as to which types of properties might remain under the jurisdiction of the *res privata*, and which might now be managed by the *patrimonium*. The emperor himself doubtless suffered little hardship as the *res privata* funds must have been buoyant after the recent confiscation of lands from Zeno and his Isaurian followers, and it may have been the confiscated land itself which was now dealt with by the new ministry. Precedents for Anastasius' reorganisation imply that confiscated land could have formed at least part of the property to be managed by the new ministry. It was the influx of property to the *res privata* after the condemnation of Albinus, Niger and their associates which encouraged Septimius Severus to make the *res privata* distinct from the *patrimonium principis*.⁷⁶ In the west, at the beginning of the

⁷² Cf. MacMullen (1976) 25.

⁷³ C.J. I.34.1; cf. John Lydus, *de Mag.* II.27.2. The duties and rank of the *comes rei privatae* and *comes patrimonii* were very similar; cf. Bury (1911) 79–80 and Delmaire (1989) 45.

⁷⁴ The only possible drawback to this otherwise fair reorganisation was that the allocation of income from imperial estates resulted in the *comes sacrarum largitionum* being indebted to those administering the estates (ie the new *comes sacri patrimonii*) and not having the same degree of control over the funds as he had over the *chrysargyron* revenue; cf. Delmaire (1989) 268, *CAH* IX.193f.

⁷⁵ Cf. Stein (1919) 173, Bury (1923) I.442, Jones (1964) I.237, I.424–425, and Kaplan (1992) 149. However, there has been disagreement as to the exact nature of Anastasius' reorganisation. Some of the first studies on this question concluded that all the private property of the emperor was made available for state use under the auspices of the newly created ministry of *patrimonium*; Karlowa (1885) I.842, His (1896) 21–28, Hirschfeld (1905) 47–48, and Karayannopoulos (1958) 72–74. Karayannopoulos argued that all property belonging to an emperor should become state property on accession and that therefore Anastasius was not in a position to give generously to the state that which the state already rightfully owned. However, in practice, emperors had always enjoyed the right to free disposal of their *patrimonium*, however acquired, and Anastasius' action no doubt benefited the *sacrae largitiones*.

⁷⁶ Cf. Monks (1957) 273.

fifth century, an official with the title *comes sacri patrimonii* and the rank of *illustris* was created to administer the sudden increase of *res privata* caused, on this occasion, by the confiscation of the property of Gildo in Africa.⁷⁷

Nevertheless, even if Anastasius' financial position was aided by the extra revenue from Isaurian lands, there is no doubt that his creation of a new *comitiva*, under which funds from the *res privata* directly compensated for the loss of the *chrysargyron* revenue, was to the advantage of the state.⁷⁸

The Commutation of the Land Tax

A measure which indirectly offset the loss of the *chrysargyron* revenue, and helped to boost monetary circulation, was the commutation of the land tax used to provide supplies of food (*annona*) and animal fodder (*capitus*) for the army, from 'in kind' to a payment in gold.⁷⁹ As mentioned earlier, the land tax was paid to the state in kind and resources collected were passed on to the army and were also used to pay the salaries of officials (both civil and military). The commutation of rations and fodder began illegally and in 358 Constantius II ordered *duces* to accept supplies delivered to them, rather than demanding cash instead.⁸⁰ However, not long after this, in 365, Valentinian I began the process of commutation to gold when he decreed that the *limitanei* should receive their rations in kind for nine months and as cash for the other three.⁸¹ Over the next decades, successive emperors sought to control the process of commutation and to regulate the rate of exchange.⁸² The eastern emperors were far more cautious and the *adaeratio* proceeded far more swiftly in the west.⁸³ A *novel* of

⁷⁷ Interestingly, in terms of parallels, there was a *comes rei privatae* who dealt with the administration of imperial property under Odoacer; cf. Mommsen (1910) 464–465 and Stein (1919) 173, and Theoderic introduced a *comes sacri patrimonii* in 505; cf. His (1896) 73, Stein (1949) II.206, Delmaire (1989) 694.

⁷⁸ Bréhier (1914) col.1449, Stein (1949) II.206, Coyne (1991) 126, and Jones (1964) I.237 who states that the abolition of the *chrysargyron* "may be regarded as his personal gift to the empire", contra Capizzi (1969), p.146, who believed that the new official was only to administer the funds of the emperor, not of the state.

⁷⁹ C.J. X.27.1–3, Mal. 394, Evag. III.42, Niceph. Cal. XVI.44.

⁸⁰ Cf. Jones (1964) II.629.

⁸¹ Cf. Jones (1964) I.460.

⁸² For example, the 412 law concerning the abuse of tax collection by provincial governors through the *curiales* who collected gold in lieu of the *annona*. Without regulation the rate of levy kept rising. The law stated that any commutation must be done at market rate, or at a rate fixed by the praetorian prefect; cf. C.Th. VII.4.32, with Jones (1964) I.397. On the problems for the payroll caused by the varying rates of commutation, Jones (1964) I.461.

⁸³ Cf. Jones (1964) II.630.



Valentinian III indicates that before the Vandal invasion, Mauritania and Sitifensis paid all taxes in gold;⁸⁴ and in 445, the *annonae* and *capitus* of the troops and *dux* were commuted to fixed payments of four *solidi*. In 458, under Majorian, the land tax of Italy was collected entirely in gold.⁸⁵ In the east however, while by 423 the Palatine officials were being paid in gold, and by 439, those of the rank of *spectabilis* and *clarissimus* as well, the ordinary soldier continued to be paid in kind. Salaries were paid in gold only to officers, or to men on special leave. The commutation of land tax from 'in kind' to gold, assessed on average prices over a period of five years, was still a special privilege in 436.

Constantine's reorganisation of the army whereby units were billeted on towns where they might readily purchase supplies rendered the *annona* almost redundant. Even when the majority of the army had been stationed on the frontiers, there had been obvious disadvantages to ■ tax levied 'in kind'; the logistics of transporting supplies from areas where there was ■ surplus to areas where supplies were inadequate had often proved problematic.⁸⁶ In emergencies, when additional food was required for the army, the state enforced the sale of essential commodities at a special fixed low price.⁸⁷ The price of the supplies was then deducted from their gold tax, or if it exceeded the amount of the tax owed, the difference was made up with gold coin.⁸⁸ This *coemptio* (συνωνή) was extremely unpopular, and in the sixth century landowners in certain parts of Italy (Calabria and Apulia) took the option of paying a surcharge to avoid the penalty.

The shortcomings of this whole process of taxing land for army pay and provisions occupied Anastasius' attention from the start.⁸⁹ A constitution of 30th July, 491 addressed to the praetorian prefect, Matronius, forbade property owners to try to escape the *coemptio* and even ruled that imperial property should not escape the charge.⁹⁰ Later, during the prefecture of Polycarp (498), the process of commutation

from tax 'in kind' to gold was rationalised: Anastasius converted the bulk of the land tax into gold, levying in each area only as much as was needed for immediate supply for the local troops. The rate of commutation was fixed annually for each province by the praetorian prefect. Anastasius forbade the compulsory purchase of provisions, except in emergencies, and only with his authorization.⁹¹ The only area to be exempt was the diocese of Thrace where the barbarian incursions had diminished the number of peasants to such an extent that the tax was too low to support the armies and *coemptio* applied to both landowners and merchants.⁹² As in Italy, the payments were to be set against the gold tax or paid back in gold coin.

Anastasius' rationalisation of the collection of the land tax resulted, as noted above, in the simplification of the collection and distribution of revenues, the reduction in wastage of perishable goods and difficulties in the logistics of transport. The prefecture was able to accumulate ■ reserve of gold, and thus the *arca praefectura*, first mentioned in 382, grew in importance until it became the chief state treasury.⁹³ The increased circulation of gold in towns where soldiers

⁹¹ C.J. X.27.2-3, Mal. 394, with Laniado (2002) 42-45. Karayannopoulos (1956) 72 underlines the point that this is not a new tax, but merely a change to the existing system. He also suggests, however (*ibid.* (1956) 80, (1958) 119ff, esp. 121; contra Charanis (1962) 335; cf. Lemerle (1979) 5), that the commutation concerned not only the *annona*, but also the provision of soldiers by landowners (ie. the *praebitio tirorum* was replaced by the *aurum tironicum*; for examples, see Jones (1964) I.149, 420, with no. 21, III.100). Karayannopoulos suggests that this was a temporary measure, designed to meet an acute crisis in the state's finances, but was, in fact, unhelpful as it resulted in a lack of soldiers. He attributes this putative focus on the economy rather than the military to the fact that Anastasius was not a soldier but a bureaucrat. However, it is clear that the gold tax on the land to provide military supplies and the gold tax paid in place of providing recruits were two entirely unrelated taxes, and paid to two different financial departments: the former to the praetorian prefecture and the latter to the *sacrae largitiones*. The only factor they shared was a gradual commutation from payment 'in kind' to gold payments. Anastasius' reform concerned only the *annona*. Williams and Friell (1999) 205 comment that the popularity of payment in gold resulted in a marked improvement in army recruitment.

⁹² On the hardships in Thrace and the *annona*, see Stein (1949) II.203, Velkov (1962) *passim*, Lemerle (1979) 6 and Kaplan (1992) 525. Evagrius (III.42) reacted with hostility to Anastasius' measure: "but he acted unworthily of these in devising the so-called gold impost, and by disposing the military expenses onto the taxpayers most heavily" (Πέπραχεν δὲ ταύτων οὐκ ὀξία, τήν τε καλουμένην χρυσοτέλειαν ἐπινοήσας καὶ ἀπεμπολήσας τὴν στρατιωτικὴν δαπάνην κατὰ τῶν συντελῶν ἐς τὸ βαρύτερον) (tr. Whitby). However, Evagrius may have been objecting to the continuation of *coemptio* in certain circumstances; cf. Whitby (2000) 192-193, n.167.

⁹³ Cf. Jones (1964) I.461. On the commutation under Justinian, see Jones (1964) II.670-673. It should be noted that Anastasius was merely continuing a gradual process which was already complete in the west and which was intended to bring greater efficiency to the supply of army provisions and pay. The timing of the measure passed in the same year as the coinage reform designed to stabilise monetary economy reveals careful

⁸⁴ *Novel* XII.46, with Jones (1964) I.208.

⁸⁵ *Novel* II.3; Stein (1949) II.199, Jones (1964) I.208.

⁸⁶ Cf. Capizzi (1969) 143, Bréhier (1914), col.1450.

⁸⁷ Lemerle (1979) 5 follows Stein's view that the use of the *coemptio* became "regular and fundamental in the state's economy" towards the end of the fifth century, and notes the significance of the timing of Anastasius' measures, first in regulating, and then changing the system completely.

⁸⁸ The practice of deducting the price of supplies from the tax owed was carried out under Odoacer; Ennod. *Vit. Epiph.* LXXX.106ff; Bréhier (1914) col.1450.

⁸⁹ For discussion on the increase in payments to the field troops and the benefits to the soldiers of having their pay in cash, not 'in kind', see below, pp.213ff.

⁹⁰ C.J. X.27.1, with Lemerle (1979) 6, Laniado (2002) 42.

were billeted stimulated the local economy. Whatever the benefits, however, a tax in gold is of little use if not supported by a secure monetary economy, and it was this weakness which was addressed by the third major reform of 498.

The Coinage Reform

The first step of the coinage reform was piloted through by the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, John the Paphlagonian, in 498.⁹⁴ He introduced large bronze coins marked with the value on the reverse: M for a forty *nummi* piece which was also known as the *folles* and weighed nine grammes,⁹⁵ K for twenty *nummi* (weighing four and a half grammes), and I for ten *nummi* (weighing two and a quarter grammes). As Marcellinus Comes remarked: "By striking, in his own name, the coins which the Romans call 'terunciani' and the Greeks 'follares' the emperor Anastasius brought ■ peaceful change to the people".⁹⁶ The exchange rate was fixed at four hundred and twenty *folles* (sixteen thousand, eight hundred *nummi*) to the *solidus*.⁹⁷ In 512, Anastasius doubled the weight of these denominations to eighteen, nine, and four and a quarter grammes respectively and introduced another coin marked E, the five *nummi* piece, weighing two and ■ quarter grammes.⁹⁸ The *solidus* was now retariffed at seven hundred and ten

planning; this was not a quick substitute for the *chrysargyon* revenue, nor an underhand attempt to tax the poor; cf. Vasiliev (1932) 145, Lindsay (1952) 118–119.

⁹⁴ Mal. 400 noted the appointment of John the Paphlagonian as *comes largitionum*, and added: "This man changed all the current small coinage into *folles* which were to be current from then on throughout the Roman state" (ὁστις ἅπαν τὸ προχωρὸν κέρμα τὸ λεπτὸν ἐποίησε φολλερὰ προχωρεῖν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν κατάστασιν ἔκτοτε) (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). On the dating of the reforms, see Hendy (1985) 476–477 and (1989) VI.10. He notes that most changes to the bronze coinage fall into a quinquennial pattern (thus suggesting that the office of *procurator monetae* was held for ■ five year period). Although the reforms of Anastasius are recorded under 498 and 512, he notes the significance that the years September 496 – August 497 and September 511 – August 512 were both the fifth years of the indictional cycle, and suggests that the reforms were recorded in the year in which they made their impact on circulating coinage; this resulted in a discrepancy between dates.

⁹⁵ For discussion on the significance of the value mark of forty, see Hahn (2000) 14–15.

⁹⁶ *nummis, quos Romani teruncianos vocant, Graeci follares, Anastasius princeps suo nomine figuratis placibilem plebi commutationem distraxit*, Marc. C. 498 (tr. Croke). Croke (1995) follows the version which gives *terunciani* (rather than *terentiani*). A *teruncius* originally weighed one third of an ounce or one thirty-sixth of a pound, and therefore, one fortieth of a *denarius*, and thus the use of the term *teruncianos* must be a reference to the *folles*, the forty *nummi* piece; Bellinger (1966) 84, Metcalf (1969) 13, Callu (1974) 551, Hendy (1985) 477 and Croke (1995) 110, Hahn (2000) 14; cf. Harl (1996) 192f.

⁹⁷ Cf. Morrisson (1989) 243.

⁹⁸ *Chronicon ad 724*, 824.

folles (eight thousand, four hundred *nummi*). The original coins of the 498 reform remained in circulation and continued at half their marked value, while the gold *solidus*, *semissis* and *tremissis* continued to be struck as before and circulated freely.⁹⁹ It was also in 512 that Anastasius opened the new mint at Antioch.¹⁰⁰

One of the chief objectives of the coinage reform must have been to stabilise the relationship between gold, silver and bronze and to reduce the excessive multiples of the bronze *nummus*. As described above, there was great fluctuation in the value of the *nummus* against the *solidus* which, especially over the fifth century, became the main coin used for military and diplomatic expenses. Although the silver *siliqua* retained an invariable ratio weighing one twenty-fourth of a *solidus*, by the mid-fifth century silver coins were no longer in mainstream circulation. The small bronze *nummus* of low value, often with an illegible inscription, was in short supply, and was frequently supplemented with unofficial local imitations. This led to overproduction and their consequent devaluation.¹⁰¹ From the beginning of the fifth century, there were no coins (except for the silver half *siliqua*, struck in very small quantities) between the *nummus* and the gold *tremissis* which was worth four to five thousand little bronze coins.¹⁰²

Various measures were taken to stop the fluctuation of the exchange rate.¹⁰³ A *novel* of Valentinian III in 445 stipulated that the *solidus* was not to be sold for less than seven thousand *nummi* when bought from a money lender for seven thousand and two hundred *nummi*, and ■ similar scale existed in the east.¹⁰⁴ However, the shortage of gold in Zeno's reign, resulting no doubt from the huge loss of reserves in the disastrous Vandal expedition in 468, along with the inefficient management of resources by Zeno and Basiliscus, caused a breakdown in the established exchange rate. By 498, the *solidus* was worth sixteen thousand, eight hundred *nummi* in Constantinople.¹⁰⁵ The indistinct and

⁹⁹ See Grierson (1982) 52–56 for gold coinage and 56–57 for silver.

¹⁰⁰ Other functioning mints were located at Constantinople, Nicomedia and Thessalonica; Bellinger (1966) 87 and Hendy (1985) 397. Much has been written about the process of minting coins — the significance of the different *officina* (subdivisions of the principal mints) marks on coins, and the type of dies, whether careful and accurate or experimental, and the numbers of coins made from dies: see especially Metcalf (1961) and (1969) 16ff, and Shaw (1963). For a description of coins minted during Anastasius' reign, see Bellinger (1966) *passim*.

¹⁰¹ Grierson (1959) 77, Harl (1996) 175ff.

¹⁰² Metcalf (1969) 1ff, Hendy (1985) 475–476, Harl (1996) 175ff on the progressive debasement or abolition of the fractional *nummi*.

¹⁰³ For details, see Harl (1996), 177.

¹⁰⁴ Hendy (1985) 477.

¹⁰⁵ Grierson (1959) 78–80, Metcalf (1969) 11, Harl (1996) 178 — especially on the

low value coins, often termed *nummi minimi*, were easily counterfeited; leading to a loss in imperial revenue.

Anastasius' reform appears to have origins in the west. In Vandalic North Africa, under the rule of Gaiseric, the *nummus* devalued against the *solidus* until there were twelve thousand *nummi* to the *solidus*, a forty per cent increase on the tariff in Rome in 445.¹⁰⁶ In 487–488, Gunthamund reformed the bronze currency by issuing a series of denominations: a *folles* of forty two *nummi*, and fractions of twenty-one and twelve *nummi*. This series was followed by a second series and included a four-*nummi* piece.¹⁰⁷ The coins bore marks of value and the legend KARTHAGO. Silver was minted in denominations of a whole, a half and a quarter *siliqua*; as there were twenty-four *siliquae* to the *solidus*, the *siliquae* fractions equated to one forty-eighth and one ninety-sixth of a *solidus*. There were five hundred *nummi* to the *siliqua*. Working on such different systems, exchange between bronze and silver had created some very awkward fractions. The choice of multiples of *nummi* reflects an attempt to create an easy exchange rate with the *solidus* and *siliqua* as they represent the fractions one twelfth, one twenty-fourth, one forty-second, and one one hundred and twenty-fifth of a *siliqua* rounded up.¹⁰⁸

The coinage of the Ostrogoths was simpler.¹⁰⁹ Odoacer and Theoderic struck *solidi* in the name of the eastern Roman emperor. Their silver coinage came in two denominations: two hundred and fifty, and one hundred and twenty-five *nummi*. Following Gunthamund's reform, Theoderic also turned his attention to his bronze coinage. He introduced large bronze multiples of the *nummus*, a *folles* worth forty *nummi* and a twenty-*nummi* piece. Though the new multiples were exact fractions of the *solidus* of twelve thousand *nummi* (and the *siliqua* of five hundred), they did not form exact fractions of the silver coins of two hundred and fifty, and one hundred and twenty-five *nummi*. Thus, like the Vandals, the Ostrogoths made up the fractions with the production of a second series including smaller denominations such as the bronze ten and five *nummi* pieces.¹¹⁰

failure of gold currency in the fifth century. The progressive devaluation of the *nummi* may be charted in the *Tablettes Albertini*, a collection of legal documents on wooden tablets dated to the last three years of Gunthamund's reign (484–496).

¹⁰⁶ On coinage and the economy in North Africa, see Harl (1996) 186ff.

¹⁰⁷ Hendy (1985) 478–484, Harl (1996) 187.

¹⁰⁸ For example, one twelfth of five hundred is forty one and two thirds: hence the value of the *folles* was rounded up to forty two; cf. Hendy (1985) 480, Harl (1996) 187–188.

¹⁰⁹ Hendy (1985) 484–490, Harl (1996) 188ff, Kent (1971) IV.

¹¹⁰ A lighter weight *folles* (ten grammes) was minted in a third series. It is most likely that Ostrogothic reform followed that of the Vandals; cf. Hendy (1985) 487ff, Harl (1996) 189;

A third source of inspiration open to Anastasius were the multiple *nummi* coins issued under Theodosius II, Leo I, his wife Aelia Verina and Zeno. They were very similar in design to the coins of Valentinian I, Theodosius I and Arcadius, while Verina's was similar to that of Aelia Flacilla, Theodosius' first wife. The fourth-century issues may be identified with the *decargyrus*, a multiple of ten, possibly even termed a *folles*. It is possible that, just as the fifth-century coins were imitative of fourth-century issues, so the coins of the Anastasian reform were in turn inspired by those of the fifth century.¹¹¹ In terms of design, there was certainly continuity and progression from early in the fifth century. As an example, the reverse of the coin which was issued on the occasion of Anastasius' marriage to Ariadne shows Christ standing between the emperor and empress joining their right hands.¹¹² Christ has a nimbus, long hair and a beard and there is a circular inscription of *FELICITER NUBTIIS* (a misspelling for *nuptiis*). The design was probably directly inspired by a coin commemorating the marriage of Marcian and Pulcheria: Christ, portrayed with short hair, standing between the imperial couple who held hands before him. The same misspelt inscription was used. This, in turn, was a replica of the *solidus* issued by Theodosius II in 437 on the marriage of his daughter Eudoxia to Valentinian III where he stood between the bridal pair.¹¹³

The first stage of the coin reform came at a time when Anastasius was making serious changes to fiscal legislation. As the Flavian general, Q. Petilius Cerealis, had commented to the Gauls, "no peace without arms, no arms without pay, no pay without taxes"; Harl rightly added "no taxes without coins".¹¹⁴ If the land tax, which provided the bulk of the state's revenue, was to be predominantly gold-based, it was imperative that coinage was secure. During Anastasius' reign, the gold *solidus*, minted at Constantinople and Thessalonica, remained the main coin for taxation, military payments, diplomacy and high level transactions. But for everyday needs, smaller change was required. Few silver coins were minted,¹¹⁵ and it was therefore crucial that a stable

contra Grierson (1959) 78 and (1982) 4 who believes that the Roman senate set the trend in 476 and was followed by the Carthaginian senate in the 480s. Harl (1996) 190 notes the care taken by the Vandals and Ostrogoths to continue Roman traditions in the minting of coins; they used archaizing types even in the innovative bronze coinage.

¹¹¹ cf. Hendy (1985) 490–492, Hahn (2002) 15.

¹¹² Zacos and Vegliery (1959) and (1960).

¹¹³ The design was also similar to a marriage belt and rings in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection; cf. Kantorowicz (1960) 3–15.

¹¹⁴ *nam neque quies gentium sine armis neque arma sine stipendiis neque stipendia sine tributis haberi queunt*, Tacitus, *Historiae* 4.74, quoted by Harl (1996) 207.

¹¹⁵ For discussion on Anastasian silver coinage, Bendall (1998) 390–391. Some silver

bronze coinage, with a sensible exchange rate against the *solidus*, should be established. A huge number of *folles* were minted during the reigns of Anastasius and Justinian, perhaps in excess of ten million coins,¹¹⁶ thus bringing to an end the shortage of usable coins.

The success of the Anastasian reform lay in the fact that a large coin of plain bronze formed the basis of the currency rather than one of bullion, which was always vulnerable to the reduction of silver content by either private, illegal or governmental action.¹¹⁷ As well as stopping the soaring inflation,¹¹⁸ it enriched the treasury as the new coins could be sold to the provinces at a profit. Finally, the official coins in clear denominations must have been easier to deal with than the old, worn *nummi* pieces of the past; the clarity of the value mark on the reverse brought an end to previous disputes concerning the denomination and would have instilled greater public trust in the currency.¹¹⁹ The reform was very long lasting: coins of the Anastasian model with the imperial portrait on one side and a large M on the other were still struck in Constantinople in the 830s.¹²⁰

coins were still minted, though much of the silver coinage was recast into plate and exported to the Persian empire; cf. Harl (1996) 192. Mango and Boyd (1993) esp. 214–215 argued that Anastasius made use of the considerable surplus of silver which had been accumulating since the cessation of silver coinage (c.400), by selling it for gold. This income of gold could have been another resource used to cover the *chrysargyron* deficit and pay, for example, the five-yearly army donatives. Mango noted that significantly it was the year 498 which also saw the introduction of a multiple silver stamping system; the stamp was used as a mark of authorisation for the release of state silver. Some of the earliest known stamps include the monogram of John the Paphlagonian himself.

¹¹⁶ Calculated by Harl (1996) 194.

¹¹⁷ It is clear that the new coins were widely used, both for military expenditure as well as in the market place; cf. Metcalf (1969), pp.94–99, chapter 8: “How were the small *folles* used?” From an examination of hoards discovered in Galatia, Syria, Palestine and Scythia, Metcalf concluded that the new coins were used by the military in areas of conflict. Criticism of the reform can be found in texts hostile to Anastasius, such as the Oracle of Baalbek 168ff: “... and hates all beggars. He will ruin many from among the people lawfully or unlawfully ...” (... μισῶν πάντας τοὺς πτωχοὺς, πολλοὺς δὲ τὸν λαὸν ἐπολιτίζει δίκαιως ἀδίκως ...) (tr. Alexander). It has been suggested that prices would now be rounded up to the nearest multiple of five, causing hardship for the poor; cf. Alexander (1967) 95–97 and R.P. Blake in ‘The Monetary Reform of Anastasius I and its economic implications’ in *Studies in the History of Culture* (1942); contra Morrison (1989) 244 who argued that the new favourable exchange rate of bronze and gold would have made the reform popular with the lower classes.

¹¹⁸ Grierson (1959) 80 and Jones (1953), esp. 316; the government, by and large, now fixed the rate of production of coins and their weight, so that fluctuations in the exchange rate were kept to a minimum.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Jones (1953) 316, Morrison (1989) 244, Harl (1996) 192.

¹²⁰ Cf. Metcalf (1969) 2.

The Introduction of the Vindices and the Defensor Civitatis; the Decline of the Curiales?

Anastasius was also concerned that the collection of tax should be carried out efficiently. He therefore transferred the task of levying tax, hitherto carried out by the *curiales*, to new officials, the *vindices*, who were appointed in Constantinople.¹²¹ There had already been some initial reforms concerning tax collection. If a *compulsor* had to be sent to a province because the revenue was not forthcoming or delayed, then his fees and expenses were to be charged, not to the taxpayers but to those responsible for collecting taxes. If it was necessary to send a second *compulsor*, then the first *compulsor* together with those in the provincial *officium*, were liable for costs incurred. This was an effort to keep the official scale of fees paid to the curial collectors and the officials of the *largitiones* and praetorian prefecture down to one *siliqua* per *iugum*, as opposed to sixty *siliquae* per *iugum* in the west.¹²²

The introduction of the *vindices*, however, was a far more radical change. The measure was initiated by Marinus the Syrian, probably at the beginning of the sixth century, and therefore closely following the reforms of 498.¹²³ There is little evidence about the mechanics of the reform, but it seems that *vindices* were appointed by the praetorian prefect not to take over but to supervise the collection of taxes which was still carried out by the *curiales*.¹²⁴ We have evidence for the

¹²¹ See above, pp.187–188, on the putative decline of the *curiales*. On the meaning of the term *vindex*, Laniado (2002) 32. On the introduction of the *vindices*, see John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.49, Mal. 400, and Evag. III.42. If Priscian (*Pan.* 194–197) is referring to the introduction of *vindices*, he is the only source to praise the new officials; cf. Appendix B, p.276, and Chauvot (1986) 157 on Priscian's dilemma; his dislike of Marinus had to be tempered by his need to praise the acts of the emperor.

¹²² Cf. X.19.9, 496; with Jones (1964) I.468 with n.138, III.131 and Laniado (2002) 40–41.

¹²³ On Marinus, see above, pp.191–192. The dating of the legislation is unclear. Cyril of Scythopolis *Vit. Sab.* LIV claims that *vindices* had been established in Palestine well before 511/512. If Priscian is referring to the *vindices* at *Pan.* 194–197 (see above, n.122) and if his panegyric was complete by the summer of 502, they must have been introduced by then; on the dating of the panegyric cf. Appendix B, pp.272–277. This would mean that the introduction of the *vindices* closely followed the tax reforms of 498 and Marinus' appointment as *tractator*; cf. Jones (1964) I.347 (contra Chauvot (1986) 158–159, who dated the *vindices* to 506/507 to fit his dating of Marinus' prefecture). It is not unlikely that *vindices* were introduced in the first part of Anastasius' reign, and not during the later prefecture of Marinus (512–515). On previous references to *vindices*, probably alluding to *defensores*, see Laniado (2002) 29.

¹²⁴ Cf. Laniado (2002) 30–31 and Brandes and Haldon (2000) 144–145. The direction and inspection of tax collection was carried out by the *principales* while the actual collection was executed by the *curiales*. It was the role of the *principales* which the *vindices* took over. Laniado (2002) 31–32 dismisses the claim that the characterisation of *vindices* in *Novel XXXVIII* as *μισθωταί* (those who are hired or pay rent) indicates

installation of *vindices* at Alexandria, Antioch, Tripolis, and Anazarbus.¹²⁵ This was no doubt an effort to stamp out abuse where rich and wealthy landowners were treated leniently and the *curiales* appropriated for themselves some of the tax levied, but it also recognised the increasing failure of the *curia* to organise efficient, honest tax collection. Various attempts had been made in the past to make the system more effective, but with little success.¹²⁶ It appears that while the *vindices* were unpopular with the upper classes and the *curia*, there was a sharp increase in profit to the imperial treasury.

The *vindices* also controlled civic finance and had to collect enough taxes to cover municipal expenditure. Anastasius maintained the regulation of Valentinian I regarding the revenue from municipal property: the town retained one third, the state two thirds. We have the details of one scheme organised by Potamo, the *vindex* of Alexandria, for the apportionment of revenues.¹²⁷ From this scheme, we know that four hundred and ninety-two *solidi* went towards the public baths and five hundred and fifty-eight and a half *solidi* were required for the transport of grain.¹²⁸ The export tax was one thousand, four hundred and sixty-nine and a half pieces of gold (increased by a quarter under Justinian). Administration of customs was transferred from the control of the *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* to the *vindices* and ultimately to the praetorian prefect.¹²⁹

Attention has been drawn to the office of *pagarch* with reference to the introduction of the office of *vindex* and the changes in municipal government.¹³⁰ The title of *pagarch* was not new in the sixth century; it had previously applied to curial officials who controlled tax collection in villages from Diocletian's reorganisation. The *pagarchs* of the sixth century exercised greater powers. Usually wealthy landowners of

a system of leasing taxes. The auction of the taxes of cities such as Antioch and Alexandria would require a personal fortune on an imperial scale.

¹²⁵ *Chron. Pasch.* 626; Sev. Sel. Let. I.27 — addressed to two *vindices* at Anazarbus; I.9 — addressed to Stephen, bishop of Tripolis, which includes a mention of Theodore, the governor and *vindex*; cf. Laniado (2002) 30. Chauvot (1986) 158, looks at the limited application of the new office. It may have been that *vindices* were tried first in a limited number of places to test their success. The attestations of Malalas and Evagrius that *vindices* were working in all cities may be a reflection of the situation under Justinian; cf. Laniado (2002) 34–35.

¹²⁶ Jones (1964) I.456–457 on tax collection by curial officers (*procuratores* or *susceptores*). Unsuccessful reforms include the collection of tax on senatorial estates by the provincial *officium* in 396; in 397 half this tax was unpaid.

¹²⁷ Edict XIII.15; cf. Laniado (2002) 32.

¹²⁸ See Johnson and West (1967) 104 for further details of Potamo's budget.

¹²⁹ See below p.218 n.176 on the management of customs and the introduction of the *commercarii*, directors of the customs bureau.

¹³⁰ Cf. Liebeschuetz (1973) and (2001) *passim*.

senatorial status, they were selected by the provincial governor or the praetorian prefect at Constantinople, although there might be considerable local influence in the appointment. They now acted as directors of the tax offices, carried considerable powers to enforce the payment of taxes and were supported by a large department.¹³¹ It appears that they carried out the duties previously undertaken by the *exactor civitatis*.¹³² In many ways, the roles of the *pagarch* and the *vindex* appear very similar, although it does not seem to be the case that the former was simply the Egyptian term for the latter; both offices are mentioned in Justinian's thirteenth Edict. How the offices complemented each other remains unclear but what may be more significant is the developing trend in municipal government. Both reflect the concern of the central administration to remove the management (if not the actual collection) of taxation away from the *curiales* to new powers directly accountable to the praetorian prefect.¹³³

As was noted above, the *curiales* found that others were gaining increased powers in the administration of local government, and not just with regard to the collection of taxes.¹³⁴ Anastasius strengthened the hand of the bishop and the *defensor*.¹³⁵ In 409, Honorius had passed a similar law in which the *defensor/curator* was to be elected by the bishops, landowners and the most prominent *curiales*.¹³⁶ Anastasius renewed this in a law (19th April 505) stating that the *defensor* must be orthodox and swear an oath before the bishop.¹³⁷ The general extension of the administrative functions of bishops was designed to safeguard the interests of the taxpayer and ensure that the troops received their *annona*.¹³⁸ It is clear that Anastasius was keen to protect the rights of this newly created electoral body. From the Cilician port of Corycus, there are several inscriptions which mention the committee made up of

¹³¹ It appears that they were held personally responsible, however, for any taxes not collected, and this may explain why several *pagarchs* were frequently appointed.

¹³² Liebeschuetz (1973) 38, 44 on their increased power in collecting taxes; Liebeschuetz (2001) 189.

¹³³ See e.g. Liebeschuetz (1973) 45.

¹³⁴ Anastasius followed previous emperors in also attempting to strengthen the position of the *curia*, particularly by monitoring immunity of the *curiales*. For the legislation and discussion, see Laniado (2002) 37–38.

¹³⁵ This was the first formal inclusion of the bishop and clergy in secular civic government. After the decline of the *curia*, it was believed that the bishop offered the best chance of stability and continuity. His involvement in overseeing the *defensor* and the *sitona*, whose roles both required moral duties, was thought to be especially appropriate; cf. Liebeschuetz (1997) 117, (2001) 150.

¹³⁶ *C.J.* I.55.8, Jan. 409.

¹³⁷ *C.J.* I.4.19 (=I.55.11); Chénon (1889) 345–346, Karayannopoulos (1958) 224ff and esp. 227, Liebeschuetz (1997) 117, (2001) 55f, 107f, Laniado (2002) 27ff, 38–39.

¹³⁸ *C.J.* I.4.18, XII.37.19.1; Stein (1949) II.212–213.

various landowners (κτήτορες) along with the bishop and clergy, which was responsible for electing the *defensor*. In an edict addressed to the praetorian prefect Leontius, Anastasius set out the procedure for the election, forbidding the officials of the provincial governor to interfere with the designation of the *defensor*. This was in reply to a petition from the new committee, which had obviously had concerns that its autonomy was to be compromised.¹³⁹ To the new committee he also entrusted city finance and the appointment of the corn buyer (*sitona*).

The introduction of the *vindices* and the creation of a new committee to elect the *defensor* and *sitona* together formed part of the gradual devolvement of power away from the *curia*. This was a trend which had begun after the 'third-century crisis', despite a great deal of legislation designed to safeguard the survival of the *curia*, and would eventually end with the replacement of the *curiales* by a new governing class, the notables. Anastasius' role in this development was singled out for criticism by both John the Lydian¹⁴⁰ and Evagrius.¹⁴¹ John, in particular, was a traditionalist who was fond of bemoaning the passing of old customs and institutions. However, the careers of both John and Evagrius were illustrative of the problem of the young élite leaving the provincial *curia* and seeking more lucrative and influential posts in the imperial capital.¹⁴² It is certainly clear that Anastasius' measures

¹³⁹ *Mon. Asiae Min. Ant.* III (1931) 125, no.197, A and B. On the inscriptions from Corycus, see Trombley (1987); on the Anastasian edict, Stein (1949) II.212, n.4, Capizzi (1969) 149, n.235, Chauvot (1986) 155, n.330, Liebeschuetz (2001) 55f. The Corycus edict is not dated, though it is believed to be later than the legislation of 505 which still mentions the *curiales* as part of the committee responsible for electing the *defensor*; cf. Liebeschuetz (2001) 107–108.

¹⁴⁰ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.49. John's personal dislike of Marinus was no doubt at least partially responsible for his invective. It should also be remembered that John was writing on the theme of Justinian's restoration of ancient Roman customs; cf. Chrysos (1971) 99f. Laniado (2002) 36 also notes the tendency of Byzantine authors to attribute to one emperor an administrative or social change which had taken place over centuries.

¹⁴¹ "[Anastasius] also removed the collection of taxes from local councillors and appointed the so-called *vindices* over each city, at the suggestion, they say, of Marinus the Syrian who exercised the highest of offices which men of old called the prefect of the palace. As a result of this the revenues were greatly reduced and the flower of the cities lapsed: for in former times the nobility were inscribed in the cities' albums, since each city regarded and defined those in the councils as a sort of senate." (περιεῖλεν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν φόρων εἰσπραξίν ἐκ τῶν βουλευτηρίων, τοὺς καλουμένους βίνδικας ἐφ' ἑκάστη πόλει προβαλλόμενος, εἰσηγήσει φασὶ Μαρίνου τοῦ Σύρου τὴν κορυφαίαν διέποντος τῶν ἀρχῶν, ὃν οἱ πάλαι ὑπαρχον τῆς αὐλῆς ἐκάλουν. Ὅθεν κατὰ πολὺ οἱ τε φόροι διεπρῦσαν τὰ τε ἄνθη τῶν πόλεων διέπεσαν. Ἐν τοῖς λευκάμασι γὰρ τῶν πόλεων οἱ εὐπατρίδαι πρόσθεν ἀνεγράφοντο, ἐκάστης πόλεως τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βουλευτηρίοις ἀντὶ συγκλήτου τινὸς ἐχούσης τε καὶ ὀριζομένης.) Evag. III.42 (tr. Whitby). Cf. Jones (1964) II.760, Whitby (2000) 193, n.168.

¹⁴² For the view that the decline and fall of curial government resulted from increased

brought a sudden end neither to the *curiae*, nor to all prosperity in the provinces.¹⁴³ There is plenty of evidence from the Novels of Justinian which proves they were still in existence later in the sixth century: *decuriones* were in fact last mentioned in the time of Leo VI (886–912).¹⁴⁴ There is also renewed emphasis on the underlying strength of the provincial city and its social élite which continued in some places as late as the seventh century; cities were able to continue to flourish even without the customary leadership of the *curiales* and this guidance was now often offered by the bishop and clergy.¹⁴⁵

Agrarian Legislation

If the land was the main source of imperial revenue, and the collection of that revenue was to be more efficient, then it was imperative that all land must be worked as productively as possible.¹⁴⁶ Anastasius introduced two measures to ensure that the land was always provided with workers, and that cases of uncultivated soil would not be at the loss of the imperial treasury.

pressure by the imperial government in addition to the new openings provided by the larger centralised civil service, Liebeschuetz (2001) 400.

¹⁴³ Laniado (2002) 45–46 argues that the abolition of the *chrysargyron* masks the basic trend in fiscal policy (i.e. the increase of gold revenue) and that therefore Anastasius was hardly likely to be neglecting the interests of the *curiales*, the municipal tax collectors. This seems a sound analysis, though Laniado's reliance on the *Oracle of Baalbek* and on John of Antioch who both criticise imperial fiscal policy should be questioned; cf. Haarer (2004).

¹⁴⁴ For examples of the *curia* cited in legislation, see Chrysos (1971) 100ff. *Decurions* are mentioned under Leo VI in *Novel* 46. See also Chauvot (1986) 158. Concern that Malalas' reference to the creation of *vindices* implies an end to the *curiae* is misplaced (e.g. de Ste Croix (1981) 473). The passage reads: "[Marinus] dismissed all members of the city councils, and in their place created the *vindices*, as they are known, in each city of the Roman state" (ὅστις τοὺς πολιτευομένους ἅπαντας ἐπήρε τῆς βουλῆς, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἀντ' αὐτῶν τοὺς λεγομένους βίνδικας εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν τῆς Ῥωμανίας) (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). As discussed, it is clear that the *vindices* replaced only the *principales* in their role as directors of municipal tax collection. On this issue, see further Jones (1964) II.760, Liebeschuetz (2001) 108–109, Laniado (2002) 27–29 (for a detailed discussion on the evidence of Malalas, John the Lydian and Evagrius), 33, 35–36.

¹⁴⁵ Whittow (1990); on pp. 22–23 examples are given from Thessalonica in the sixth to seventh centuries where the archbishop, clergy and leading laymen controlled municipal administration.

¹⁴⁶ On the perceived decline of the peasant class, the conflict of the free peasant proprietor battling to retain his small plot against the increasing encroachments of the wealthy landowners, see e.g. Charanis (1944–1945) 40–41 and Danstrup (1946) 239. Lemerle (1979) 10ff, esp. 15–16 argued that the idea of the extreme poverty of the rural peasant was a rhetorical commonplace and that while barbarian raids did cause a certain amount of hardship, there was much more prosperity in the countryside than is usually thought. Tchalenko (1953) 1.422 concluded that the Syrian limestone massif prospered under Zeno and Anastasius.

The first decree concerned the rights of *coloni*.¹⁴⁷ In 419, Honorius had passed legislation which granted freedom to *coloni* after thirty years' absence from their land.¹⁴⁸ This relaxation, however, was abused by *coloni* who ran away from the farms to which they had been tied and leased another plot of land, pretending that they were free men. After thirty years, their freedom became a legal formality. Valentinian III moved quickly to close this loophole; an *originarius* who moved to another farm would simply become, after thirty years, the *originarius* of the new landlord.¹⁴⁹ The only means of gaining freedom was to leave the land and pursue another occupation for thirty years. Honorius' constitution was included in the *Theodosian Code*, but not that of Valentinian, thus allowing the continuing exploitation of the loophole in the east. In 500, Anastasius dealt with the situation in a different way, enacting that a free man who had leased a farm for over thirty years would then be tied to the land but remain free in all other ways.¹⁵⁰ Honorius' law was tightened up by Justinian who eventually abolished the right of the *adscripticius* to free himself by the thirty years' absence rule.

Anastasius' second agrarian reform concerned the problem of sterile land, which was now highlighted by the commutation of *annona* into a gold tax.¹⁵¹ Farms which could no longer be cultivated for any reason, such as the poverty of the owner or a deficiency in labour for example, became a heavy public burden as others in the community became responsible for the abandoned land. This additional payment was

¹⁴⁷ Specifically, the legislation applied to the *originales* or *adscripticii*. The term *coloni* referred to the descendants of the tenants included in the census of Diocletian, in which all peasants were registered in their own village or under the name of their landlord. When the numbers of the descendants of these *coloni* began to decline, the number of 'free *coloni*' rose (ie. *coloni* with no hereditary connection to the estate on which they worked, and who were not tied to it). By the end of the fourth century, there was a clear distinction between the free *coloni* and the tied *coloni*, known as *originales* (*originarii*) or *inquilini* in the west and *adscripticii* in the east. On *coloni*, Jones (1964) II.795–800, Lemerle (1979) 20f, Haldon (1990) 26–31 and 125.

¹⁴⁸ *C.Th.* V.18.1.

¹⁴⁹ *Val. III, Nov. XXXI.451*.

¹⁵⁰ *C.J.* XI.48.19 (500), with Charanis (1951) 135. Lemerle (1979) 21–22 does not see this legislation as providing protection for elderly farmers against eviction from their land; rather it constituted an infringement on their freedom; contra Kaplan (1992) 160 who believed that the law equally benefited proprietor and peasant. Lemerle suggested that *coloni* would simply evade the ruling by leaving their land shortly before the completion of thirty years. However, it is clear that a reasonable number must have remained, perceiving some measure of security in being tied to their land; Justinian went on to extend the legislation to include children. On the benefit of Anastasius' legislation to the state, Jones (1974) 305ff.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Haldon (1990) 26–31.

known as the *epibole* (ἐπιβολή).¹⁵² Successive emperors had sought to establish who should be liable for this payment and to ensure that the imperial treasury did not suffer. A law of 412 laid down that landowners who were already paying taxes should not be responsible for the payments for deserted land which they did not own, but if one part of their own land became unproductive, the whole estate remained liable for the original tax estimation (ἐπιβολή ὁμοδούλων). Similarly, if parts of the estate were sold or divided in inheritance, the estate was still treated as a fiscal unit by the government. It seems that both Anastasius and Justinian sought to address cases where owners of the deserted land could not be found; in these instances, owners of lands registered in the same census district became responsible (ἐπιβολή ὁμοκλήνων).¹⁵³ Only the lands of the recently created *patrimonium* were to be exempt from the ἐπιβολή ὁμοκλήνων.¹⁵⁴ By ensuring that deserted land could always be allocated, if not to the original landowner then to those in the same census district, Anastasius ensured that tax would always be forthcoming from the land, even if it was currently uncultivated.¹⁵⁵

Army Reforms

Anastasius was also concerned to see that fair and efficient administration extended to the organisation of the army which was, after all, responsible for the security and stability of the empire.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² On the ἐπιβολή, see Danstrup (1946) 242ff and Jones (1964) II.814ff.

¹⁵³ *Novels* CLXVI, CLXVIII (containing fragments of the scheme initiated by the praetorian prefect, Zoticus) and CXXVIII.7,8.

It is most likely that it was the tax liability, and not the lands themselves, which was transferred; cf. Karayannopoulos (1958) 242 following Danstrup (1946) 248: "Here there is no idea of transfer of land, no *adiectio sterilitum*", and Lemerle (1979) 9ff who examines Karayannopoulos' article 'Die Kollektive Steuerverantwortung in der frühbyzantinischen Zeit' in *Vierteljahrsschrift für social- und wirtschaftsgeschichte* 43 (1956) 289–322 and concludes that the *epibole* is essentially only a transfer of tax; contra Charanis (1962) 335 following Ostrogorsky, who maintains that the transfer of land was the main issue and the transfer of tax merely incidental. This view seems unlikely, however, as the point of the *epibole* was to ensure that the fisc did not lose taxes from uncultivated land, so it would be necessary to transfer only the tax, not the land.

On the terminology ἐπιβολή ὁμοδούλων and ἐπιβολή ὁμοκλήνων, Jones (1964) II.815, n.105; Lemerle (1979) 18–19.

¹⁵⁴ *C.J.* I.34.2. Bury (1923) I.444–445 assumes that they were still subject to the ἐπιβολή ὁμοκλήνων; contra Jones (1964) III.267, n.105, who argues they were exempt.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Laniado (2002) 45 who notes that this measure, attributed by Procopius to Justinian and criticised severely, must have been very unpopular.

¹⁵⁶ At Anastasius' accession the crowd encouraged the new emperor to turn his attention

During his own reign, the example of Vitalian showed only too clearly how a charismatic rebel leader could exploit the disaffection of any section of the army. Anastasius passed a series of laws concerning the protection of the ordinary soldier against exploitation by military officials.¹⁵⁷ A law of 491 addressed to the *magister militum* Longinus, Zeno's brother, aimed at preventing tribunes and their officers from appropriating state pay.¹⁵⁸ The emperor also tried to stop the commissaries (*actuarii*, *optiones* and *chartularii*) enriching themselves on the army provisions passing through their hands and exploiting the soldiers who had to pay for their supplies. Officers known as *ergatores* were frequently sent out by the *magister militum*. They were to pay their *solatio* direct to the soldiers and any disputes were to be cleared by the *priores* of the army unit. Actuaries were forbidden to demand more than one *tremissis* per *solidus* as interest on any debt.¹⁵⁹ Regulations for leave became less stringent. Tribunes now had the power to authorise leave for up to thirty men in a unit.¹⁶⁰ Another law (passed January 1st, 492) aimed to improve military justice.¹⁶¹ It gave to the *duces limitanei* the same level of control over the *praesentales* troops stationed in their area as they exercised over their own troops. The law also limited the *sportulae* paid to magistrates in courts to one *solidus*, and it prevented soldiers from facing prosecution in both civil and military courts.

Evidence for further reforms can be found not in the *Codex Justinianus*, but from inscriptions. Fragments of imperial edicts which have been discovered at military posts in Arabia and at Cyrenaica

to the army; *de Cer.* I.92.246. For a general discussion on the state of the army at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries, and the increase of the use of federates and barbarians within the imperial ranks, see Stein (1949) II.85–89, Jones (1964) esp. II.654–686, Chauvot (1986) 128–131, Cameron (1993b) 52–56, *CAH XIV* chapters 11 and 17. Anastasius did not seek to change the essential make-up of the army, but aimed to improve conditions for ordinary soldiers. On the size of the army (fifty-two thousand) despatched against the Persians in 503, see *Proc. B.P.* I.8.4, Josh. 54. More troops were sent in 504, adding substantially to, or perhaps even doubling the current force; cf. ch. 3, p.57. In his panegyric, Priscian commented: "Recruits now swell the army ranks with strong soldiers and their bravery not bribery earn them true standards" (*tiprones forti numeros nunc milite complent / veraque non pretio, sed robore signa merentur*) *Prisc. Pan.* 204–205 (tr. Coyne). Coyne (1991) 151–152, however, is incorrect in attributing *lex C.J.* XII.44.3 (concerning the promotion of recruits) to Anastasius. The law, according to Krueger (1954) 14–15, was passed by Honorius and Theodosius in 408. Treadgold (1995) 14–15, 203 argues that Anastasius' generous allowances to soldiers encouraged many volunteers, ending forced conscription and leading to a reduction in barbarian mercenaries.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Kaegi (1981) 43, Greatrex (1998) 39–40.

¹⁵⁸ Fragments of this constitution are found in *C.J.* XII.37.16–19.

¹⁵⁹ Stein (1949) II.198, n.2, Karayannopoulos (1958) 173 and Capizzi (1969) 149–150.

¹⁶⁰ *C.J.* XII.37.16.2–4. Authorisation above this limit resulted in penalisation.

¹⁶¹ *C.J.* XII.35.18.

(Libya) reveal measures to stamp out abuse and to improve military justice and conditions for ordinary soldiers.¹⁶² The fragments of the edict found at Bostra covered three such measures.¹⁶³ One enactment (the second article) dealt with military rankings and was intended to stamp out unauthorised promotions which cost the treasury unnecessary expenditure. The third article concerned the recruitment of officials; posts of the *duciani* were no longer to be sold, but guidelines were laid out for the mode of recruitment for each job. Finally, the last section decreed that *primiscrinii* should not hold the same position for more than five years nor return to the same bureau. Anastasius was clearly concerned that offices should be rotated in order to avoid corruption generated by length of service.

The epigraphical evidence from Libya is a summary of one or many ordinances concerning the rights and powers of the *dux* and the troops under his authority. One inscription is addressed to Daniel, *dux* of Pentapolis, concerning administration and the rights of the soldiers in his province. It focused especially on the registration of *duces* (section one), and their number and duties (section two). They and the *numerari* and *primiscrinii* should not accept donations from the soldiers (sections four and five). The distribution of rations was regulated (section six) and the duties and rights of the soldiers themselves were set out (sections six to eleven). Chapter thirteen decreed the penalty for any contravention of this ruling, while the final section laid down fixed contributions so there should be no excuse for irregularity.

Four fragmentary inscriptions found at Beersheba have sometimes been connected with these edicts from Arabia and Cyrenaica. The Beersheba inscriptions form part of one or more imperial edicts and deal with the tax assessments for cities and villages in various parts of Palestine.¹⁶⁴ The first inscription published fixed tariffs applicable to the whole empire and therefore aimed at correcting the abuse of overcharging. A few towns were listed along with the schedule of payments in *solidi*. The second inscription listed eighteen towns from the region of Wadi Arabah in Palestina III, again with the schedule of payments; and the third and fourth inscriptions listed towns in all three Palestines

¹⁶² For the inscriptions from the diocese of the Oriens, Waddington (1870) III, nos. 2033 and 1906, Littmann, Magie and Stuart (1921) 24–42, no.20 and 250–251, no.562, and Sartre (1982a) nos. 9045 and 9046. See also Stein (1949) II.197, n.2. For the inscription from Libya, see Oliverio (1936) 135–163 and *SEG IX.356*.

¹⁶³ For this inscription and translation (and discussion of the first article) see ch. 2, pp.44–46; cf. Sartre (1982a) 118.

¹⁶⁴ See Abel (1909), Alt (1921) 4–13 and (1923) 52–55, Kraemer (1986) 122–124, Mayerson (1994) 259ff, Migliardi Zingale (1994) 201–209; for a new edition of the fragments and discussion, di Segni (1999b) 625–627.

with the towns arranged in groups according to the amount of tax paid. It is clear that different sections of the provinces (the *limitanei* and the *συντελεσταί* — civilian tax payers) were liable for different taxes, of which three have been suggested: the *annona militaris* (now converted to a cash payment),¹⁶⁵ ■ supplementary tax for members of the imperial civil service (δουλοί), and a specific tax for the *vicarius*. A further fragment of the inscription has recently been found containing nine lines and allowing us to reconstruct most of the opening formula: it informs us that the addressee was ἡ σὴ μεγαλοπρέπεια which refers to the *dux* or governor of Palestine.¹⁶⁶ There remains no record of the date, but the mention of *συντελεσταί* dates the fragments to the first half of the sixth century when these officials came into being. However, it is unlikely that they are connected with the inscriptions relating to the organisation and justice for troops in Arabia and Libya discussed above as the Beersheba inscriptions merely supply lists of assessments.¹⁶⁷ It has been suggested that they belong to the reign of Justinian and may be connected with *Novel CIII* (536) in which Justinian laid out a change of power structure in Palestine. A new office of proconsul was introduced and the Beersheba fragments listed new tax assessments, the revenues of which would be used to support the proconsulship. In this case, it is therefore probable that the *vicarius* was the assistant of the proconsul, and the *δουλοί* were his staff.¹⁶⁸ Alternatively, it is possible that the edict was connected with the changes to the role of the *limitanei* in Palestine, described by Procopius in his *Anecdota*.¹⁶⁹

Other Economic and Social Reforms

Reforms to ensure good practice in administration and finance connected to the military formed part of a wider scheme to tighten administration in other areas, but also to bring relief to those parts of the empire suffering from natural disasters or from war, and to improve the rights and duties of imperial officials, the justice system and legislation relating to the family.

¹⁶⁵ Suggested by Abel (1909) 95 and Alt (1921) 7, contra Mayerson (1994); cf. di Segni (1999b) 626. It is hardly likely that soldiers would be taxed directly for revenue to supply their own *annona*.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. di Segni (1999b) 626f.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Sartre (1982a) 119, Mayerson (1994) 145f.

¹⁶⁸ For this date, Mayerson (1994) 146ff; contra di Segni (1999b) 627.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Proc. *Anec.* XXIV.12–14; this was suggested to me by Prof. Leah di Segni in e-mail correspondence, 1/10/2002.

The Abydos Edict

- Εἰ δέ τις [τολήσει παραβῆναι ταῦτα, θεσπίζομεν αὐτὸν] στρατίας ἐκπίπιν κ[αὶποινῇ ὑπο-]
βάλλεσθαι, τὸν τε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχον[τα τ]ῶν σ[τενῶν ποινὴν]
πεντήκοντα χρυσοῦ κατατιθέναι λίτρας εἰ[γ]ε οἰω-
5 δῆποτε τρόπῳ παραβαθῶσιν οἱ τύποι τῆς ἡμετέ-
ρας εὐσεβίας. Ἀγρυπνῖν γάρ αὐτὸν καὶ πολυπραγμονῖν
ἔκαστα βουλόμεθα ὥστε μηδένα κακουργοῦντα
λανθάνειν, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς προτεθῆναι τοῖς τό-
ποις ἐθεσπίσαμεν, καὶ στήλαις ἐγχαράττεσθαι λιθίναις
10 ἐνπηγνυμέναις ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ ὥστε καὶ τοὺς
ἀπαιτοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιτουμένους ἀναγινώσκιν
τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς μὲν δεδιότας ἀπέχεσθαι τῆς ἀπλησ-
τίας, τοὺς δὲ θαρροῦντας μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι βλάβης καὶ τὸν
περίβλεπτον κόμητα τῶν στενῶν αἰεὶ τὴν ἀπλήν
15 ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ὁρῶντα τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις πῖραν, εἰ ῥα-
θυμήσῃ, προσδέχεσθαι +
Γνώσις συνηθειῶν ἃς παρῖχον πρὸ ἐτῶν εἴκοσει
καὶ εἴκοσει δύο τῶν στενῶν οἱ ναύκληροι, ὡς πολυπραγμο-
νήσας ὁ ἐνδοξώτατος ἑπαρχος τῆς πόλεως ἀνήγαγεν
20 τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ εὐσεβίᾳ, ἃς τινας καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος καὶ με-
τὰ ταῦτα προσήκει μόνας διδόναι οὕτως.
Οἱ οἰνηγοὶ πάντες οἱ τὸν οἶνον κομίζοντες εἰς τὴν βασι-
λίδ[α τα]ύτην πόλιν πλὴν μόνων τῶν Κιλικῶν
κλασσικοῖς τῶν στενῶν φύλλις ἑξ καὶ ξέστας δύο.
25 Οἱ ἔλληγοι καὶ ὀσπρηγοὶ καὶ λαρδηγοὶ κλασσικοῖς τῶν στενῶν
φύλλις ἑξ. Οἱ Κίλικες ναύκληροι κλασσικοῖς τῶν στενῶν
φύλλις τρεῖς. Καὶ ὑπὲρ πρόβας κεράτιν ἐν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκ-
πορίζιν κεράτια δύο. Οἱ σιτηγοὶ κλασσικοῖς τῶν στε-
νῶν φύλλις τρεῖς καὶ λόγῳ πρόβας σίτου μόδιος εἰς
30 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκπορίζιν ἐντεῦθεν ἑτέρους φύλλις τρεῖς.¹⁷⁰

If anyone [dares to transgress these dispositions we decree that he] should be dismissed from his post [and face a penalty] and he who has command of the straits should pay fifty pounds of gold, if these decrees of our piety are infringed in any way. For we want him to be vigilant and very attentive so that no contravention of the law escapes his notice. Also we have decreed that these dispositions must be displayed in these places and engraved on stone steles fixed facing the sea, so that those who demand payment and those from whom payment is demanded may read the law and the former, being fearful, will abstain from greediness, and the latter, having no fear, will not suffer harm, and the count of the straits, permanently seeing the threat in writing, will expect this threat to become fact, should he be negligent. +

¹⁷⁰ The text of the inscription is taken from Callu (1982) 732. The translation is based on the French translations by Durlat and Gillou (1984) 584–585 and Dagron (1985) 453.

Since the glorious prefect of the city, after a detailed enquiry, referred to our piety notification of the *sportula*¹⁷¹ which the captains¹⁷² in the straits offered twenty and twenty-two years earlier, it is fitting that this *sportula* alone¹⁷³ should be given at the present time and afterwards as follows:

All wine-carrying ships which bring wine to the imperial city, except the Cilicians alone, [should give] to the *classici* of the straits six *folles* and two pints¹⁷⁴ of wine, ships carrying oil, dry vegetables and lard [should give] to the *classici* of the straits six *folles*, the Cilician captains [should give] to the *classici* of the straits three *folles*, and for the examination¹⁷⁵ one *keration* and on departure two *keratia*. The ships carrying corn [should give] to the *classici* of the straits three *folles* and for the certificate of examination, one *modius* of corn and on departure from there, three more *folles*.

This decree specifies the tariffs on boats in the Hellespont collected by officials posted at Abydus and Hieron.¹⁷⁶ Further information is provided in Procopius' *Secret History*.¹⁷⁷ Observation posts were established at both ports to keep an eye on naval traffic passing to and from the Black Sea and the Aegean, past the imperial capital. The official at Abydus, the *archon* or count of the straits (ἄρχων τῶν στενῶν or κόμης τῶν στενῶν), was to prevent vessels entering the Hellespont carrying weapons without permission, and to ensure that all ships had the relevant papers signed by the *magister officiorum*. The official at Hieron was to ensure that no forbidden cargo reached Russia or the Caucasus.¹⁷⁸ However, while he was paid ■ fixed salary by the state, his counterpart at Abydus was recompensed with the revenue

from a tax imposed on captains or shipowners of boats carrying particular types of cargo.¹⁷⁹ As stipulated by Anastasius, the *archon* of the straits himself was responsible for collecting the surtax (*sportula*). To counter the possibility of abuse of power, the officer had to put down ■ deposit of fifty pounds of gold which would be confiscated if it was deemed he had acted irregularly.¹⁸⁰

The exact nature of this decree has been debated: was it designed to provide additional customs taxes destined for the imperial fisc?¹⁸¹ From the evidence provided by the inscription and by Procopius' *Secret History*, it seems more likely that it was designed to control shipping around the imperial capital. The official stationed at Abydus would be paid by revenues from passing ships, thus avoiding further drain on the treasury; and measures were in place to prevent the abuse of position. The inscription clearly indicates the payment of the official and his surveillance fleet though *sportula*, and Procopius indicates that there was a change in practice (to a state salary paid to the *archon* of the straits at Abydus) at the beginning of Justinian's reign (although we are not sure this means 518 or 527).¹⁸² It is therefore clear that these surtaxes (or *sportula*) should not be confused with the ordinary customs tax which continued to be paid to the customs bureau at Constantinople.

The inscription is not dated and attempts to date it have highlighted problematic issues, especially concerning exchange rates and the reason for the different rates imposed on the Cilicians. Much work has been carried out to establish ■ fixed relationship between the various methods of payment (*folles*, *keratia*, pints of wine and *modii* of corn). It has been argued that a feasible relationship between the different types of payment can only be found prior to Anastasius' coinage reform of 498.¹⁸³ Durliat and Guillou argue plausibly that the initial reform was

¹⁷⁹ The decree seems to single out ships carrying produce usually associated with the *annona*; cf. Durliat and Guillou (1984) 590.

¹⁸⁰ Anastasius' apparent care to avoid abuse may be compared with the later situation recorded by Proc. *Anec.* XXV.6: "And the [customs officials], being concerned only with demonstrating to [Justinian] their loyalty towards him, finished by plundering from the shippers the entire value of their cargoes". (οἱ δὲ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἢ εὐνοϊὰν οἱ τὴν ἐς αὐτὸν ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχοντες ἀπαξάπαντα πρὸς τῶν πλεόντων τὰ τῶν φορτίων τιμήματα ληϊζόμενοι ἀπηλλάσσοντο.) (tr. Dewing). Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 90–91. Durliat and Guillou (1984) 593 note that the change of practice under Justinian (the Abydus officer was paid by the state in the same way as his colleague at Hieron) did not result in an increase in taxes. On the importance of this change in providing ■ *terminus ante quem* for this inscription, see Callu (1982) 734.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 85.

¹⁸² Dagron (1985) 454.

¹⁸³ See Durliat and Guillou (1984) 595 for their calculations, followed by Dagron (1985) 454; contra Callu (1982) who argues for ■ date in the period between 512 and 538;

¹⁷¹ On the problems of understanding the nature of συνήθεια, Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 80ff, Durliat and Guillou (1984) 592–593 and Dagron (1985) 454–455.

¹⁷² For discussion on translation of the term ναύκληροι, see Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 75, 241–244 and Durliat and Guillou (1984) 589–591.

¹⁷³ For discussion on the use of the term μόνας, see Durliat and Guillou (1984) 591.

¹⁷⁴ The Greek ξέστης (Latin *sextarius*) is almost equivalent to the English pint.

¹⁷⁵ On the term πρόβα, see Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 242–243, Durliat and Guillou (1984) 591–592 and Dagron (1985) 455.

¹⁷⁶ As noted in ch. 2, pp. 45–46, Anastasius was also responsible for the reorganisation of the customs bureau and the introduction of *commercarii* as the agents responsible for the collection of customs tax. The port tax was considered one of the most lucrative indirect taxes; cf. Danstrup (1946) 139. For further detail on the port tax, see e.g. Mordtmann (1879) 307ff who wrongly ascribes it to Justinian (contra Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 76), von Lingenthal (1879) 312–315, Dittenberger (1905) no. 521, Grégoire (1922) 4–5, no. 4, Bury (1923) II.355, de Laet (1949) 459f, Ahrweiler (1961) 240–242, Lemerle (1964), Capizzi (1969) 142, Callu (1982), Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 75ff, Chastagnol (1976) 302–304, Hahn (1981) 36, Durliat and Guillou (1984), and Dagron (1985). See also Laniado (2002) 41 with references n. 133. See Proc. *Anec.* XXV and John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.51, 58, 68–70 noting that rates for traders were much heavier during the reign of Justinian.

¹⁷⁷ Proc. *Anec.* XXV.

¹⁷⁸ The forbidden goods included wine, oil, lard and arms; *C.J.* IV.41.

introduced around 470 by the emperor Leo but was allowed to lapse around 472 until restored by Anastasius in 492 (thus accounting for the reference to "twenty and twenty-two years" in lines 17 and 18) when as a new emperor he was enthusiastic to improve previous practice.

However, this explanation raises problems when considering the variation in charges levied on the Cilicians. Interpretation of this variation depends on whether the charges exacted for the examination of cargo and for departure from the straits were applied only to the Cilicians and to corn-carrying ships, or whether they also applied to the first two categories of ships listed: that is, those carrying wine, oil, dry vegetables and lard. It is generally concluded that the additional payments applied to all the ships, which means that the Cilicians benefited from a small discount.¹⁸⁴ However, if the inscription is to be dated to the opening years of Anastasius' reign, it is not clear why the Cilicians should be advantaged in this way during a period of hostilities in which the emperor had passed a number of anti-Isaurian measures.¹⁸⁵ It is known that wine exported from Cilicia was considered a speciality: was this, therefore, a way of encouraging trade even during the prosecution of war?¹⁸⁶ Alternatively, if the edict was renewed shortly after the end of the Isaurian war in 498 (before the effects of the coinage reform could be felt on exchange rates) the reduction for Cilician ships may have been an encouragement for the resumption of trading. This would give a date of circa 476 for the first promulgation of the decree, and it is not entirely implausible to imagine that Zeno would have been anxious to keep an eye on shipping passing Constantinople after his recent return to his capital following the usurpation of Basiliscus. In this context, it is entirely fitting that Cilician ships would have been taxed rather more lightly.

contra Hahn (1981) 36–38 and Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) who date the decree to 498, the year of the first coinage reform.

¹⁸⁴ Lemerle (1964) 227, Durlat and Guillou (1984) 588–589 and Dagron (1985) 454 contra Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 87–90. If the additional payments do apply to all four categories, this means that corn-bearing ships pay the least overall; Durlat and Guillou (1984) 595–596 suggest that corn ships would be easier to search and check than boats carrying a mixed cargo or amphorae.

¹⁸⁵ Durlat and Guillou, *ibid.* cannot suggest a reason for Anastasius' leniency towards the Cilicians. Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963) 89–90 argues that her interpretation of the application of the additional payments to the Cilician ships alone makes sense of the whole chronology: the decree was introduced under Leo who was heavily influenced by the anti-Isaurian Aspar; it fell into disuse during the ascendancy of the Isaurian Zeno; it was restored by Anastasius at a time of hostilities against the Isaurians.

¹⁸⁶ Dagron (1985) 454–455.

Reductions and rebates of taxes

Greater efficiency in management of imperial resources meant that Anastasius was in a position to assist provinces and cities in financial difficulty.¹⁸⁷ There are a number of cases where Anastasius reduced or suspended taxation, often for very specific reasons. One such reduction applied to the *capitatio humana et animalium*. This was a tax imposed on owners and cultivators of land, which tapped the wealth of those rearing livestock and, like a poll tax, fell on those working on the land and on their children. It therefore caused particular hardship to those with large families but a small property. In 514, Anastasius reduced by a quarter the payment for those in the dioceses of Asia and the Pontus.¹⁸⁸

A year after the reduction of this tax, Anastasius set up in the capital a fund, with a revenue of seventy pounds of gold per annum, to help offset the costs incurred by the clergy of the Great Church in celebrating funerals.¹⁸⁹

On many occasions, Anastasius was prompted to help cities or provinces which had suffered from either natural disasters or the effects of war. In 499–500, when the harvest in Mesopotamia was ruined by locusts, he reduced taxes and provided money for the destitute.¹⁹⁰ It is also reported that he sent much gold to the survivors of the Rhodes earthquake.¹⁹¹ Cities devastated by the Persian war were given assistance. Between 503–506 he reduced the taxes on cities which were heavily burdened with the responsibility of providing supplies to the imperial army; and after the war Celer and Calliopius were instructed to make further concessions as they deemed necessary. At Amida the tax was remitted for seven years and at Edessa it was reduced by half, and the emperor gave two hundred pounds of gold for the

¹⁸⁷ That Anastasius was concerned to maintain a controlling rein on the imperial fisc is clear from his legislation; see *C.J.* X.16.13 addressed to Euphemius where Anastasius curtailed the authority of the praetorian prefect and subordinate bureaux; only the emperor should decide concessions of delay of payment of fiscal dues; Stein (1949) II.207 and Capizzi (1969) 147. There are, however, instances where the emperor was prepared to show generosity of a more private nature. When the consul Paul (498) found himself in debt to the senator and honorary consul Zoticus, after holding munificent celebrations for his consulship, Anastasius gave him two thousand pounds of gold to pay off the debt without leaving him penniless; cf. John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.48.

¹⁸⁸ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.47, John of Ant. fr.214e.2, plus comments by Stein (1949) II.207, n.2, Karayannopoulos (1958) 195, Capizzi (1969) 150, n.242, though he dates this reform to 513, Williams and Friell (1999) 126 and Laniado (2002) 40.

¹⁸⁹ *C.J.* I.2.18; Bréhier (1914) cols.1450–1451, Capizzi (1969) 145, Liebeschuetz (2001) 167.

¹⁹⁰ Josh. 42; Duval (1892) 5ff, Karayannopoulos (1958) 216 and Kaplan (1992) 380ff.

¹⁹¹ Mal. 406, Evag. III.43, Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 815 and Mich. Syr. IX.8.

reconstruction of the public baths.¹⁹² After a raid of the Bulgars on Macedonia and Thessaly in 517, Anastasius authorised the praefect of Illyricum to spend one thousand pounds of gold on ransoming captives, a task that was usually left to the Church and private charities.¹⁹³

Legislation concerning officials, family matters, the courts and the judiciary

The emperor revised the functions of his ministers and their privileges. The duties of *quaestors* and tribunes were assessed,¹⁹⁴ and while the burdens on chamberlains, praetorian tribunes and *comites consistoriani* increased, the *comites*, at least, enjoyed better legal rights. Silentiaries, significantly holding Anastasius' previous office, were also favoured with special rights of inheritance of property and exemption from guardianship and curatorship.¹⁹⁵ Legislation also included controls on the movement of officials: magistrates were allowed to travel freely between the capital and the provinces, but another law limited the use of horses to one, except in cases involving the transport of public money.¹⁹⁶

A series of laws clarified and improved existing legislation governing matters concerning the family unit. One law ruled that if a husband divorced his wife with her consent, instead of waiting five years to marry she might do so after one year (*C.J.* V.17.9). There were several laws about the rights of children, inheritance and guardianship. Fathers without children were now allowed to adopt illegitimate children to whom they could transfer their property (*C.J.* V.27.6, John of Ant. fr.215). Two laws addressed to the praetorian praefect, Constantine, in 503, dealt with the emancipation of children: one gave parents and guardians permission to emancipate children under their control, while the other secured the rights of such emancipated children (*C.J.* VIII.48.5 and VI.58.11). A number of laws concentrated on guardianship: men who had been emancipated were generally obliged to accept

legal guardianship of their brothers and sisters (*C.J.* V.30.4); and more specifically, were made legally responsible for insane siblings (*C.J.* V.70.5). In contrast, as has been mentioned, silentiaries, while in imperial service, were exempt from such burdens (*C.J.* V.62.25).

Anastasius also took steps to improve the running of the courts and the conduct of magistrates and judges. In an early law addressed to the praetorian praefect, Matronius, judges were urged not to accept evidence in any form (for example, rescript or pragmatic sanction) which appeared contrary to the law (*C.J.* I.22.6). Another law sought to ensure equity in a court of law for those who were slaves or serfs (*C.J.* II.4.43, dated 500), while *lex C.J.* VII.51.6, for example, aimed to guarantee a degree of fairness with regard to the profits and expenses of a law suit when the prosecutor and defender were not of equal social or economic standing. A similar enactment warned those with influence against using their position to supersede the authority of judges and thus evade jurisdiction (*C.J.* III.13.7). A further group of laws pertained to the lawyers and officials involved in the dispensing of justice. In 507, Anastasius responded to a petition from the local advocates of the province of Syria II, granting, on certain conditions, their requests for promotion and benefits.¹⁹⁷ Other clauses of this legislation passed at different times also considered requests for advancements (*C.J.* II.7.20) and included a stipulation on the terms and privileges of chief advocates of the bar, who must also serve as advocates of the treasury (*C.J.* II.7.21–23). Finally, an undated law limited the *privilegium fori* (the right to claim the jurisdiction of the *magistri* as defendants or as the accused in civil or criminal courts) of the officials of the *magistri militum* to the established staff (the *statuti*).¹⁹⁸

Governing the people; factions, riots and the emperor's response

While Anastasius sought to make improvements in domestic policy, his reign suffered from a more powerful social phenomenon facing the state at this time: the increasing rise in internal strife and violence orchestrated by the factions. This escalating problem began about the time of Zeno and culminated in the *Nika* riot of 532.¹⁹⁹ Anastasius

¹⁹² Cf. ch. 3, p.66.

¹⁹³ Marc. C. 517 with commentary by Croke (1995) 120. Less to Anastasius' credit was the withdrawal of the rebate of taxes of one hundred pounds of gold on *adiectio sterilium* in Jerusalem and Palestine, granted to St. Sabas. The emperor was persuaded against his original promise by the monophysite Marinus who, it was said, disliked the orthodox in Jerusalem. See Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LIV; Stein (1949) II.194–195, Karayannopoulos (1958) 266, and Capizzi (1969) 147, with n.219.

¹⁹⁴ *C.J.* I.30.3 on *quaestors*; *C.J.* I.42.1–2 on tribunes.

¹⁹⁵ *C.J.* XII.5.5 on chamberlains, *C.J.* XII.10.2 on *comites consistoriani*, *C.J.* XII.49.12 on praetorian tribunes, and *C.J.* XII.16.5 on silentiaries, with Capizzi (1969) 150.

¹⁹⁶ *C.J.* XII.1.18 on freedom of movement, with Delmaire (1989) 50; *C.J.* XII.50.23 on the limited use of horses.

¹⁹⁷ *C.J.* II.7.24, with Jones (1964) I.356–357.

¹⁹⁸ *C.J.* XII.54.5, Jones (1964) I.489.

¹⁹⁹ As Cameron (1973) 239 writes "in persistence and intensity [the faction riots] were a new phenomenon". He echoes Procopius (*B.P.* I.24.2.) who wrote: "In every city the population has been divided for a long time past into the Blue and the Green factions; but within comparatively recent times it has come about that, for the sake of these names and the seats which the rival factions occupy in watching the games, they spend

sought to control and even prevent faction riots breaking out, but as an empire-wide problem, each insurrection often with a different trigger, it was ■ difficult situation to deal with.

A great deal has been written in the past about the nature of the 'factions' (the Reds, Blues, Greens and Whites) and their relationship with other divisions of society, such as the demes. Various suggestions have been proffered: that demes and factions denoted sportive organisations based in the hippodrome, or they represented different political persuasions, religious views or social classes.²⁰⁰ It was most commonly thought that the Greens represented the poorer elements of society and the monophysites and the Blues were recruited from rich landowners who were orthodox in persuasion. It is more generally accepted now that the circus factions in the later Roman Empire were a-political, a-religious and drew on a variety of social classes.²⁰¹

Malalas informs us that Anastasius favoured the Reds, one of the minor parties, thus leaving him free to deal with and reprimand equally the greater outrages of the more powerful Blues and Greens.²⁰² This seemingly simple and potentially effective policy has aroused suspicion. As the Reds were seen to be closely aligned with the Greens

their money and abandon their bodies to the most cruel tortures, and even do not think it unworthy to die ■ most shameful death." (οἱ δῆμοι ἐν πόλει ἐκάστη ἐς τε βενέτους ἐκ παλαιού καὶ Πρασίνους διήρηντο, οὐ πολλὸς δὲ χρόνος ἐξ οὗ τούτων τε τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν βάθρων ἕνεκα οἷς δὴ θεώμενοι ἐφεστήκασι, τὰ τε χρήματα δαπανῶσι καὶ τὰ σώματα αἰκισμοῖς πικροτάτοις προίενται καὶ θνήσκουσιν οὐκ ἀπαξιοῦσι θανάτῳ αἰσχίστῳ.) (tr. Dewing).

²⁰⁰ See the discussion by Chauvot (1986) 166f, with notes 420–425, especially on the similarities and differences between the factions and the demes, 265–266, n.421. See generally, Cameron (1976) *passim*, and Winkler (1961) who reviews past literature and concludes that both the main faction parties contained a cross-section of individuals from all political and religious denominations and class distinctions. Cameron argues against the view of Manojlovic (1936) 642–656 who believes that the Blues represented the aristocracy while the Greens represented the merchants, artisans and the less well off. Lindsay (1952) 54 sees the parties divided politically and financially, while Jarry (1968) *passim*, believes that religious criteria formed part of the distinction: some monophysites, Manichees and Nestorians were Greens, while other monophysites and Chalcedonians were Blues. Dvornik (1946) 119–127, too, saw the Greens as the popular, democratic elements of society, recruited from the lower classes, who backed heretical groups, while the Blues were more conservative, from the higher classes of society and were orthodox. See also Liebeschuetz (1998), who agrees that while battles between the factions did not always involve political or religious protest and were not necessarily directed against the government, there was ■ political aspect to their actions. As the factions were paid to lead acclamations (cf. Liebeschuetz (1998) 172–174) and as acclamations played a role in the accession of the emperor (cf. Liebeschuetz (1998) 170–171) and the expressing of grievances, the factions naturally became involved. However, it is clear that no faction was consistently associated with particular politics or issues; Liebeschuetz (1998) 178ff.

²⁰¹ Cameron (1973) 233, Cameron (1976) 130ff.

²⁰² Mal. 393; cf. Greatrex (1997) 66.

(and the Whites with the Blues), this policy was often viewed as a cover for Anastasius' secret support for the Green party.²⁰³ Connections were made with Anastasius' perceived favouring of the lower classes, as suggested by his abolition of the *chrysargyron*, and his support of monophysitism: two factors traditionally linked with the Greens. Others, however, have argued that Anastasius was a secret supporter of the Blues.²⁰⁴ An examination of the riots that took place during Anastasius' reign and his response to them will show the causes and nature of the faction riots and the imperial strategy implemented to contain them.

Riots broke out in Constantinople very soon after Anastasius' accession. Marcellinus *Comes* recorded: "Civil strife arose among the Byzantines and most of the city and the hippodrome was engulfed by a blaze".²⁰⁵ The riot started because of the unpopularity of the city prefect Julian, who had restricted theatrical shows.²⁰⁶ Anastasius responded harshly, sending in his troops;²⁰⁷ but the crowd set fire to the stadium. Two years later they rioted again: "Civil strife occurred at Constantinople against the rule of Anastasius. Statues of the emperor and empress were bound with ropes and dragged through the city".²⁰⁸

²⁰³ E.g. by Manojlović (1936) 674, Lindsay (1952) 11 and Alexander (1967) 97. It is not the case, however, that the year 491 inaugurated a great period of influence for the Greens or "a new domination for the next thirty years".

²⁰⁴ Cf. Jarry (1968), and Cameron (1976) 133 saw Anastasius as favouring the Blues at least in the middle years of his reign. Jarry (1968) 121–122 rejects the text of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (in which the Reds and Greens are associated) in favour of that of Malalas 176 (which states that the Reds and Blues had been united since the foundation of the hippodrome). Malalas, however, is referring to a mythical tale and the foundation of Rome, not to the current situation. Jarry's claim that Anastasius showed no favour towards the Greens and his argument that Anastasius intervened in the Brytae festival in 501 (on which see below) as it was particularly popular with the Greens cannot be substantiated. The detailed account of Marcellinus *Comes* does not mention interference by the emperor; most of the deaths occurred as a result of the collapse of the stage. Finally, there is little evidence to support Jarry's theory that Anastasius favoured the rich landowning aristocracy at the expense of the poor; in particular, he cites the changes in municipal administration and the introduction of the new electoral body as measures to award new privileges to the upper echelons of society.

²⁰⁵ *bellum plebeium inter Byzantios ortum parsque urbis plurima atque circi igne combusta*. Marc. C., 491 (tr. Croke) with Croke (1995) 107. John of Antioch fr. 214b also describes this riot but dates it wrongly to 493; see further above, ch. 2, p.22–23 n.58, and Jarry (1968) 285f.

²⁰⁶ On the identity of this Julian, Jarry (1968) 286f and *PLRE* II.639, no.14. Julian was replaced by the emperor's brother-in-law, Secundinus, and there is some evidence that he, in turn, was replaced by the experienced Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius, whose titles already included *ex comite domesticorum protectorum* and *ex comite privatarum largitionum*; he was to be consul in 494 and was, incidentally, a literary man, known for his work in editing and publishing; cf. *PLRE* II.173f, no.11.

²⁰⁷ He was perhaps trying to establish law and order at the start of his reign.

²⁰⁸ *bella civilia adversus Anastasii regnum apud Constantinopolim gesta sunt: statuæ regis*

Detailed evidence for a further uprising in 498 is found in the accounts of Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale*.²⁰⁹ This insurrection was sparked off by the Green faction members who were initially angered by Anastasius' refusal to release their partisans who had been arrested by the city prefect for stone throwing. They were further provoked by the despatch of an imperial armed force against them. In the general mêlée in the hippodrome Anastasius' own life was endangered and a great fire was started, which destroyed not only part of the hippodrome, but also a section of the Mesê as far as the forum of Constantine. Interestingly, it seems that, though many were punished, Anastasius did replace the offending city prefect with a certain Plato, who also happened to be patron of the Greens.²¹⁰

One of the greatest disasters caused by factional strife under Anastasius happened in 501 at the Brytae festival, a celebration of dance and mime held in the theatre.²¹¹ Again the Greens seem to be to blame as the instigators of the trouble. The high loss of life was due to the collapse of the stage. There is no mention of Anastasius taking any specific action during the disturbance, although afterwards he banished all the dancers whatever their faction.²¹² Marcellinus *Comes* refers to the grief of the city at three thousand killed in such a way, and for the

reginaequae funibus ligatae atque per urbem tractae. Marc. C. 493 (tr. Croke). Jarry (1968) 290 confusingly links this with the Isaurian revolt. See also Liebeschuetz (1998) 177.

²⁰⁹ Mal. 394–395; *Chron. Pasch.* 498 with the commentary by the Whitbys (1989) 100, n.316. The riot and subsequent fire recorded by Marcellinus *Comes* under 507 is usually assumed to be a reference to the 498 incident described by Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale*; cf. Croke (1995) 113 contra Jarry (1968) 294–296 who sees it as a separate insurrection instigated by the Greens and linked with the 507 riot at Antioch. He ascribes the cause of the Constantinopolitan riot to the arrival of a monophysite Persian-Syrian painter in the capital, whom Anastasius had invited to decorate the churches of Constantinople. However, as discussed, there is no evidence that the factions were aligned on religious grounds, and there is no suggestion that the riots at Constantinople and Antioch shared a common cause.

²¹⁰ Cf. Greatrex (1997) 66 and esp. 68 for a favourable comparison with Justinian's treatment of the factions in 532 which led to the *Nika* riot. On Plato, Mal. 395; *PLRE* II.891f, no.3.

²¹¹ See the detailed and possibly eye-witness account of Marc. C. 501; also John of Ant. fr.214c, and Mal. *de insid.* 39. The text of John of Antioch actually refers to two disturbances, the first under the city prefect Helias, and the second under his successor Constantinus. It is to the latter occasion that the texts of Malalas and Marcellinus refer. We have no further information on the first occasion, on which the *PLRE* II.530 bases its entry on Helias; cf. Jarry (1968) 293–294. See further Greatrex and Watt (1999) on the nature of the Brytae and its connections with the *Maiuma* held mainly at Antioch, and a similar festival celebrated at Edessa which was abolished in 502.

²¹² In 490, Longinus had given a dancer to each of the factions, hoping to secure their backing in his bid to succeed his brother Zeno. Shortly after his succession, Anastasius banished the four dancers, although they were later reinstated; cf. Mal. 386, 393 and *de insid.* 36, 39 with Cameron (1976) 226, n.7 and Liebeschuetz (1998) 174–175, n.45–46.

emperor there was personal grief, as he lost an illegitimate son.

After several years, serious trouble again flared in the capital, in 510 and in 512; both times in response to the introduction of the monophysite addition to the Trishagion.²¹³ The second occasion was much more severe, when the violence raged for several days and caused Anastasius to go to the hippodrome without his diadem and offer to resign. The ploy was successful and the rioting ceased.²¹⁴ Apart from one last circus riot in 514 which flared after Anastasius cancelled a race-meeting as a punishment for earlier disturbances in which many were killed, including the night prefect, Geta,²¹⁵ it is clear that there was a fundamental difference between the causes of the popular insurrections at the beginning of the reign and those of the later part. The latter (except the one in 514) were caused solely by ecclesiastical discontent and there is little evidence to suggest that it was one particular party (that is, the Blues) which objected to the monophysite Trishagion.

Malalas records three faction riots outside the imperial capital, two in Antioch and one in Alexandria. At the beginning of Anastasius' reign (491), there was trouble at Antioch during which the Greens attacked Calliopius, the *comes orientis* (appointed by the praetorian prefect, Hierios). The emperor sacked the unpopular minister but awarded to his successor stronger powers for dealing with the Green faction.²¹⁶ Some years later, in 507, there were further disturbances: the crowds, led by the charioteer Calliopas, plundered and burned the Jewish synagogue at Daphni and massacred the Jews inside. Anastasius appointed Procopius of Antioch as *comes orientis* and Menas of Byzantium as *praefectus vigilum*, but they had little success in controlling the Greens who destroyed a large section of the city round the basilica of Rufinus and slaughtered the unfortunate Menas. In response, Anastasius appointed a certain Eirenaïos Pentadiastes as *comes orientis* who, we are told, "brought vengeance and fear on the city".²¹⁷ Lastly, for 515/516, Malalas records a riot in Alexandria, caused by a shortage of oil. The rioters murdered the *augustalios*, Theodosius, but they were in turn punished by Anastasius for rebelling against the governor.²¹⁸

Looking at the earlier riots, it seems that they were mostly started by

²¹³ The first ecclesiastical riot in Anastasius' reign occurred in 496 in protest at Euphemius' deposition; cf. Theod. Lect. 455 with Greatrex (1997) 64.

²¹⁴ See ch. 5, pp.156–157.

²¹⁵ John of Ant. fr.214e.12, with Mommsen (1872) 355; Cameron (1973) 233 and *PLRE* II.511.

²¹⁶ Mal. 392–393, with analysis by Jarry (1968) 284–285.

²¹⁷ καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν καὶ φόβον ἐν τῇ πόλει. Mal. 398 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). See also Liebeschuetz (1998) 177.

²¹⁸ Mal. 401–402.

members of the Greens, and Anastasius did not hesitate to take firm action against them. This hardly suggests that the emperor was an unofficial supporter of this faction through his connections with the Reds.²¹⁹ What is clear is that he sought to contain faction violence however it was started; even though critics of his heavy-handed use of force have been quick to suggest that this increased rather than reduced faction unrest.²²⁰ However, he also sought to prevent trouble breaking out in the first place. In 499, he put an end to *venationes* (the wild beast shows)²²¹ and in 502, in response to the Brytae disaster, forbade pantomimes.²²² The idea behind the measures was to channel the aggressive competition of the faction parties into the hippodrome:²²³ as the later trouble was caused especially by religious fervour and was not faction based, it could be argued that Anastasius enjoyed a certain amount of success.²²⁴ Linked to the idea of the hippodrome as the controlled focal point of factional activity was the manipulation of the popular and successful charioteer, Porphyrius. Several statues were erected in his honour, by both the Greens and the Blues, and it has been suggested

²¹⁹ Contra Lindsay (1952) 118: "under [Anastasius] Green policy reached its climax".

²²⁰ Cameron (1973) 233, contra Greatrex (1997) 68 and 71, who believes that Anastasius' hard-line stance was more effective than Justinian's vacillation.

²²¹ If *venationes* were banned in 498, how should the appearance of wild beast shows on the consular diptychs of Areobindus (506) and Fl. Anastasius (517) be explained? Théodoridès (1958) 78 gives a description not only of these diptychs, but also of an ivory of 517 with a depiction of a deer fight, and the famous Barberini ivory, dated to the beginning of the sixth century, showing a party of defeated barbarians presented with a variety of savage animals. Guiland (1966) 290 comments that, despite the ban, animal fights continued. Coyne (1991) 161 suggests that later fights were perhaps bloodless simulated contests. It is possible that the ban was a temporary measure; after all, there had been previous restrictions at the beginning of Anastasius' reign (the cause of the unpopularity of the city prefect, Julian.) Alternatively, one has to suppose that the craftsmen continued to carve traditional scenes which were no longer strictly appropriate.

²²² Proc. Pan. 16, Prisc. Pan. 218–227, John of Ant. fr.214c, and Theoph. AM 5993. Procopius and Priscian both praise Anastasius' measures to control faction violence and the morality behind the reforms (the Christian propriety of games and dancing was always questionable; see James of Edessa, *Hymns*, PO 7.715–717), though it is more probable that he acted to stop the faction riots at these events rather than out of concern for the animals or because of the "brutalizing effect of the spectacle", Cameron (1973) 228. In contrast to the panegyricists' approbation, John of Antioch complained that the cities were bereft of beautiful dancing: *χρηῶσαι τῆς καλλίστης ὀρχήσεως τὰς πόλεις*. For a discussion on the implications of the ban, see Chauvot (1986) 168ff. He believes that the banning of the *venationes* was an economic measure as they formed very expensive entertainment.

²²³ Cameron (1973) 231.

²²⁴ On the pattern and frequency of faction riots, see Liebeschuetz (1998) 182–185. He notes that faction riots often occurred in periods of imperial instability, such as the reign of Zeno, the early years of the reign of Anastasius and the later years (547–563) of the reign of Justinian.

that Porphyrius, who could be found driving for both parties, changed allegiance at Anastasius' command, in order to maintain excitement and competition in the hippodrome, where the rivalry of the two main colours could be more easily contained.²²⁵

It is clear that Anastasius used a number of strategies to combat the increasing rioting in this period. It appears that as the Greens-led riots occurred at the beginning of the reign and the later riots were not faction based, he had some success in controlling the problems of escalating faction violence. Since the factions were not defined by politics, religion or class, insurrection and imperial response cannot, with any certainty, be used as an indicator of Anastasius' favouring of any particular sector of society.

Conclusion

Anastasius' interest in and flair for the administration and reform of the state are unmistakable. His successful financial rehabilitation of the empire is undisputed, but this in turn depended on first, the smooth running of the state from the imperial *scrinia* to the provincial municipalities; and second, a correct balance maintained between taxation of the land, the imperial fisc and the sustaining of the army. Anastasius, relying on his own experience as a silentiary and on his professional and well-trained officials, was able to achieve these aims, as well as introducing a beneficial coinage reform which further stabilized the empire's economy. He was also able to turn his attention to other areas of legislation: improving the judicial system, family law and regulating the conduct of officials.²²⁶ Lastly, economic security meant that Anastasius was able to fund a number of building projects, as discussed in the next chapter.

²²⁵ Cameron (1973), *passim*, (1976) 132–137. See also above, ch. 5, pp.177–179, where the role of the Greens and Porphyrius was noted in the defence of the capital against Vitalian's forces.

²²⁶ Liebeschuetz (2001) 300 notes that there was an increase in legislation at the end of the fifth century. He argues that while it is not certain to what extent Anastasius took the initiative in the promulgation of this legislation, it is clear that his laws do amount to a programme of organised reform.

7

ANASTASIOS' BUILDING
PROGRAMME

There are ■ number of textual references and an increasing amount of archaeological evidence for Anastasios' extensive building programme.¹ Towards the end of his account of the reign of Anastasios, Malalas wrote: "In every city of the Roman state he carried out a variety of building projects, including walls and aqueducts; he dredged harbours, constructed public baths from their foundations and provided much else in every city".² John of Nikiu commented: "And the emperor rebuilt the edifices which had been burnt, and he constructed many beautiful streets; for in his mercy and compassion he loved to build edifices ... And he applied himself to completing all manner of beautiful works, that he might remain in tranquillity and peace".³ Even Theodore Lector, hardly known for his support of the emperor's religious policy, admitted: "The emperor Anastasios built many churches in Constantinople".⁴ Finally, John the Lydian wrote of the emperor's generosity in providing funds for cities, forts, messes and harbours.⁵

Anastasios' building and repair works can be roughly divided into three overlapping categories: the first, those with defence and military purposes, I have already discussed in chapters 3 and 4.⁶ The present short chapter can therefore limit itself to the other two categories: utilitarian construction, and building for prestige or for imperial propaganda.

¹ Cf. di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 263.

² ἔκτισε δὲ καὶ εἰς ἑκάστην πόλιν τῆς Ῥωμανίας διάφορα κτίσματα καὶ τεῖχη καὶ ἀγωγούς, καὶ λιμένας ἀνακαθάρας καὶ δημόσια λουτρά ἐκ θεμελίων οἰκοδομήσας, καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἐν ἑκάστῃ παρέσχε πόλει. Mal. 409 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott).

³ John of Nikiu LXXXIX.30–31 (tr. Charles).

⁴ Πολλὰς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος ἐκκλησίας ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀνέκτισεν. Theod. Lect. 468.

⁵ John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.47.

⁶ Cf. above, ch. 3, pp.65ff and ch. 4, pp.109ff.

Utilitarian Projects

Just as the Nika riot and his various wars afforded Justinian the opportunity for rebuilding during his reign, so riots, fires, earthquakes and wars provided similar opportunities for Anastasios. Many of the fires recorded in Constantinople during Anastasios' reign were the result of faction riots or religious disturbances; and the general destruction caused by these insurrections must have necessitated much repair to the affected areas of the city, particularly in the vicinity of the hippodrome.⁷ Similarly, in Antioch, during the Green party riots of 507, the *praetorium* of the *comes orientis*, the basilicas of Rufinus and Zenodotus, and the two tetrapyla on either side of the Rufinus basilica were burned down. Malalas later noted that: "The emperor built the basilica in Antioch known as that of Rufinus, and also various buildings in every city of the Roman state".⁸ Malalas also tells us that Anastasios responded to natural calamities: "During his reign the island of Rhodes suffered its third calamity from the wrath of God, at night. The emperor gave generously both to the survivors and to the city for building purposes".⁹

Other projects of a utilitarian nature stemmed not from specific damage, but from the necessity for a general overhaul or from ■ desire to improve existing services, especially if that would be to the greater economic advantage of the state. Anastasios was particularly concerned with ensuring good water supplies. There is some evidence that he was responsible for the construction of the cistern (ἡ ψυχρά) in the Sacred Palace and also the cistern of St. Mochius. With a surface area of twenty-five thousand square metres and a depth of fifteen metres, the latter was the largest cistern open to the sky in Constantinople.¹⁰ In the

⁷ Capizzi (1969) 191, notes 15–21. He lists references to various fires. The damage caused and subsequent restoration were obviously not on the scale of the rebuilding required after the Nika riot.

⁸ ἔκτισε δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ τὴν λεγομένην Ῥουφίνου καὶ κατὰ πόλιν τῆς Ῥωμανίας διάφορα κτίσματα. Mal. 398 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). For church building in Antioch, Capizzi (1969) 226.

⁹ ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἔπαθεν ὑπὸ θεομηνίας ἡ Ῥόδος νῆσος τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς πάθος νυκτός· καὶ πολλὰ αὐτοῖς τοῖς περιλειφθεῖσιν ἐχαρίσατο καὶ τῇ πόλει λόγῳ κτισμάτων. Mal. 406 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). The frequency of earthquakes and subsequent need for rebuilding has been documented by Capizzi (1969) 193–195.

¹⁰ On the cistern in the Sacred Palace, Cedr. 692, with Capizzi (1969) 199–200; on the cistern of St. Mochius, Michael Glycas, *Annals* IV.265, with Janin (1964) 205 and Capizzi (1969) 200, contra Mango (1995) 16, who believes the cistern is attributed to Anastasios on dubious authority. Anastasios, though, seems to have been genuinely concerned to ensure an effective water supply for the imperial city and the provinces, as he passed ■ law (C.J. XI.43.11) renewing a constitution of Theodosius forbidding inhabitants to draw water from public aqueducts or fountains without ■ special permit.

provinces, an aqueduct was constructed to bring water to Hierapolis. Citizens had previously drawn their water from a reservoir, but in the fifth century this had become unusable and they had been forced to make do with rain water collected in cisterns.¹¹

Anastasius was also concerned to make improvements and repairs to facilitate transport by water, vital for the economy and for trade. In Constantinople, he dredged the port of Julian: "The harbour of Julian was first drained of its waters by wheeled machines and cleaned by excavating the mud".¹² At Alexandria, Anastasius restored the famous lighthouse by protecting its base, which was being eroded by the sea.¹³ Unhindered functioning of the Alexandria harbour was essential for the shipments of grain leaving Egypt for Constantinople. There is also one reference to Anastasius' role in constructing the canal at Nicomedia, originally the project of the Younger Pliny.¹⁴

In the busy port of Caesarea in Palestine, Anastasius provided funds for the repair of the outer breakwaters at the Sebastos harbour. The northern breakwater was repaired by dredging rubble from its northern side and piling this along the highest point on its southern side.¹⁵ This use of original materials was an effective but economical way of carrying out the repair,¹⁶ and a few structural remains of the rubble rampart survive along the external harbour basin.¹⁷ On the eastern and southern edge of the inner basin, which was already silted up by the sixth century, there is evidence of a major building programme which has tentatively been attributed to Anastasius.¹⁸ This seems to have included the renovation of the Temple Platform (such as repairs to the

Offenders would be fined ten pounds of gold.

¹¹ Proc. Pan. 18; Goossens (1943) 165–167, Chauvot (1986) 160–161. The aqueduct was probably constructed in 502 contra Goossens who argues for 505–506. He sees it as a precarious solution, since during war the Persians could easily cut it and so again deprive the city of a drinking water supply.

¹² *portus Iuliani undis suis rotalibus machinis prius exhaustus caenoque effuso purgatus est.* Marc. C. 509 (tr. Croke); cf. Capizzi (1969) 200.

¹³ Bernard (1966) 105–110 and Chauvot (1986), pp. 162–163. An epigram, *Anthol. Graec.* IX.674, records the repair of the lighthouse, mentioning Ammonius, a patrician, of the fifth–sixth century (see *PLRE* II.72–73, no.8); and it probably refers to the repair at Anastasius' instigation.

¹⁴ Anna Comnena X.5; cf. Pliny *ep. ad Traj.* X.41f, 61f, with Capizzi (1969) 208–209.

¹⁵ Cf. Holfelder (1988) 58, Oleson et al. (1994) 78 and Raban (1998) 72.

¹⁶ Cf. Holfelder (1988) 59.

¹⁷ By the beginning of the sixth century, it appears that extensive repairs to the once flourishing Herodian harbour were desperately needed. Extensive damage may have been caused by changes in the sea level, or by the 502 earthquake; Holfelder (1985) 181, (1988) 58, and Raban (1991). For Anastasius' repairs, Proc. Pan. 19, with Raban and Holum (1996) *passim*, esp. 369, 375ff, 656ff and Kingsley (1999) II.295–296. On the economic and military importance of Caesarea, see Holfelder (1988) 59.

¹⁸ See especially, Raban and Holum (1996) 657 and Raban (1998) 63.

pediment vaults, extension of the walls on the north and south sides, and the construction of a large staircase from the eastern edge of the former basin to the Temple Platform) and the construction of an octagonal monument on the site of Herod's Temple to Rome and to Augustus (perhaps the Martyrium of St. Procopius).¹⁹ Also connected with this phase, a new sea wall over thirty metres wide and forty metres long was built along the south side of the inner basin, the interior of this wall consisting of re-used column shafts within a layer of beach deposits, and covered with ashlar masonry. The second/third century eastern quay was also altered, and in the process perhaps lost its maritime function, because it is thought that a rectangular 'reflecting pool' was created in front of the staircase leading to the Temple Platform. The northern side wall of the pool was incorporated into a wide ashlar-paved platform laid over the original quay. Although the harbour complex was now rather smaller than the Herodian scheme, the repairs to the outer basin of the harbour and the revitalisation of harbour facilities played a vital role in ensuring the continued prosperity of Byzantine Caesarea, which flourished until captured by the Arabs in 639/40.²⁰

Bathhouses and city improvements

Other projects that were not strictly utilitarian included the restoration of bathhouses. Epigraphical evidence reveals building activity in the reign of Anastasius at Hammat Gader which was located near the cities of Gadara and Scythopolis.²¹ Three inscriptions record the work of the governor, Alexander, who carried out repairs to the baths having received financial aid from Anastasius, and a fourth concerns the efforts of a later official but refers to the work of Alexander. All were found in the Hall of the Fountains, the main hall of the baths.

The inscriptions read as follows:

ὃν χρόνος ἡμάλδυνεν ἐλίσσόμενος κατὰ κύκλον
στήσεν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς μεγάλωνυμος ἥρωος
σπουδῇ Ἀλεξάνδροιο περίφρονος ἡγεμονῆος
Καίσαριος ναιτίρος ὃς ἔλλαχεν ἡνία Νύσης

(This place) which Time crushed, revolving in its cycle,
raised Anastasius, king hero with a great name,

¹⁹ For details, Holum et al. (1992) 100–108 and Holum (1992) esp. 26ff where the octagonal monument is dated to mid sixth century.

²⁰ Cf. Holfelder (1985) 180–181.

²¹ di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986); for references to the excavation reports, see p.251, n.1.

under the care of Alexander, the thoughtful governor,
dweller of Caesarea, who obtained the reins of Nysa [Scythopolis].²²

Μούκιος Ἀλέξανδρος πανυπείροχος ἡγεμονήων
θέσκελον ἤνυσεν ἔργον, ὃν ἔτρεφε Καίσαρος ἄστυ,
δεξάμενος μέγα δῶρον Ἀναστασίου βασιλῆος.

Mucius Alexander, being supreme governor,
accomplished this wondrous work, (he) whom the city of Caesar
nourished,
having received a great gift from the Emperor Anastasius.²³

ὁ Καισαρεύς τὸν οἶκον Ἀλέξανδρος ποεῖ
ὁ τὴν χλιαρῶν ἐπώνυμον θόλον καμών

Alexander of Caesarea is the maker of this building,
he who built the *tholos* named after him of the warm baths.²⁴

τὴν τῶν χλιαρῶν δεῖ Καισαρέως ἄλλου θόλον
καλεῖν Λέοντος ὡς Ἀλεξάνδρου πάλαι

The tholos of the warm pools should be named after another citizen
of Caesarea, Leon,
as it once (used to be named) after Alexander.²⁵

It is likely that the baths at Hammat Gader had been damaged in the earthquake which caused widespread destruction in 502, and were repaired at the end of the Persian war, perhaps after Urbicius' visit to Palestine in 505.²⁶

In Constantinople, Anastasius also saw to the construction of the public baths in the quarter of Dagistheus, which were later completed by Justinian.²⁷ At the palace at Blachernae, the emperor built a *triklinos*, which was named after him.²⁸ In the Grand or Sacred Palace, he turned his attention to the Chalkê, the monumental vestibule which served as an entrance to the palace itself; although whether Anastasius actually constructed it from scratch or merely repaired the Chalkê is not clear from the epigram which celebrates his achievement:

²² Tr. (with commentary) di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 253–257.

²³ Tr. (with commentary) di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 258–260.

²⁴ Tr. (with commentary) di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 260–262, with reference to Green and Tsafir (1982) 92–93.

²⁵ Tr. (with commentary) di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 262–263.

²⁶ On the dating, see di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 267. They also cite the evidence of St. Sabas who settled near the site of Hammat Gader in 503, but moved at the end of 505, perhaps disturbed by the new building work; Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* XXXIV.

²⁷ Mal. 435–436, *Chron. Pasch.* 528 and Theoph. AM 6020; Capizzi (1969) 199.

²⁸ Papadopoulos (1928) 131, Janin (1964) 124 and Capizzi (1969) 201. Capizzi (*ibid.*) also refers to a *triklinium* inside the Sacred Palace which was attributed to Anastasius by Zonaras XIV.4.23. Janin (1964) 112 discusses this building, but makes no mention of any involvement by Anastasius.

οἶκος Ἀναστασίου τυραννοφόνου βασιλῆος
μῶνος ὑπερέλλω πανυπείροχος ἄστυ γαίης,
θαῦμα φέρων πάντεσσιν, ...

I am the house of Anastasius, the emperor, slayer of tyrants,
and I alone far excel all cities of the Earth.
I am a cause of wonder to all ...

(*Anthol. Graec.* IX.656, tr. Paton)²⁹

Anastasius was also responsible for a new phase of building at Scythopolis, as is attested by a number of inscriptions which have been discovered throughout the city.³⁰ The area of the western bathhouse to the west of Palladius Street was embellished:³¹ for example, the propylaeum was paved by the “most magnificent *comes* and governor Severus Alexander”³² in 563 (ie.499/500) as recorded by an inscription on a marble slab in the floor at the entrance from Palladius Street. A nearby inscription of the same date records the work of Flavius Megalos “most magnificent archon”. Two identical inscriptions, one found to the north of the bathhouse along Palladius Street, record the development of a semicircular sigma (*piazza*) on the site of the city's odeon:³³

+ *haedera* A + Εὐτυχῶς + W +
Θεοσέβιος υἱὸς Θεοσεβίου
πόλεως Ἀμίσου ἐπαρχίας
Ἐλενοπόντου, ἀρχ(ων) Παλαιστ(ίνης) (δευτέρως),
ἐκ θεμελίων ἔκτισεν τόδε
τὸ σίγμα ἔτους οφ', ἰνδ(ικτιῶνος) ιε' προ-
νοησαμένου Κυλβίνου Μαρίνου
+ λ(αμπροτάτου) κόμ(ητος) καὶ πρώτου.


²⁹ Mango (1959) 26–30 speculated whether the Chalkê in question could be the Χαλκὴ τοῦ Ἰσπικοῦ, which suffered fire damage at the hands of the mob in 498, as reported by Mal. 394 and the *Chron. Pasch.* 498. Such a supposition fits the timing of the epigram, which was written just after the 498 Isaurian defeat. However, there is no other evidence that Anastasius repaired the Chalkê of the hippodrome rather than the vestibule of the palace, which was later destroyed in the Nika riot.

³⁰ For this survey of building inscriptions for Scythopolis, see di Segni (1999b) 634ff. For the early history of Scythopolis, Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 85–99, 106ff. They argue (pp.101, 106, 116) that the zenith of settlement and building reached a peak under Anastasius and Justin I, and that the town began to decline during the reign of Justinian as a result of the Samaritan revolt of 529 and the plague in 542 (pp.125ff). On the significance of the Anastasian building projects for the changing face of Scythopolis from a Roman to a Byzantine city, *ibid.* passim, esp. 120ff.

³¹ For further bibliography on the bathhouse excavation, see di Segni (1999b) 634, n.20.

³² This Alexander may also have been responsible for a βουῦργος (a public inn which provided a change of horses for the *cursus publicus* and overnight accommodation for travellers, as argued by di Segni) built outside the city wall of Caesarea; cf. di Segni (1999a) 152, 167.

³³ The odeon had probably also served as the bouleuterion; Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 121–122, n.159. For a discussion on the decline of the *boulecuria* in late antique cities, see above, ch. 6, pp.187–188, 207–211.



Good luck! Theosebius son of Theosebius, of the city of Amisos in the province of Hellenopontus, governor of Palaestina Secunda, built this sigma [piazza] from the foundations in the year 570 [ie. 506/7], indiction 15, under the supervision of Silvanus son of Marinus, *clarissimus comes* and *principalis*.³⁴

Twelve shops or offices with mosaic-paved floors were built along the new facade of the sigma; at the entrances inscriptions inviting people to enter have been found. In front of the shops a semicircular portico was constructed.³⁵

It seems that a second Silvanus, with the help of his brother, Sallustius, was responsible for petitioning Anastasius for funding for the building of a large basilica in Scythopolis, sixty metres long and almost thirty metres wide.³⁶ Two inscriptions commemorate its construction. The first, in hexameters, reads as follows:

+ ΜΈλλεν έμє προθέλυνον έπì χθόνα | διανερύσσαι
 πολὺς πανδαμάτωρ πόλιος| χρόνος άσφοος έρπων·
 Cιλβανός [δέ με στήσε] | πόνων έγκύμονι τέχνη
 ὀλβη 'Ανασ[τασίου τε.] || πολυκτεάνου βασιλῆ[ος].

Long time, the hoary all-subduer, silently creeping, was going to drag me down to earth from the foundations; but Silvanus raised me with art full of labours, and with the riches of Anastasius, the wealthy king.³⁷

The second, in prose, records:

+ Έκ δω<ε>ᾶς φλ(αυίου) 'Αναστασίου
 αὐτοκράτ(ορος) Αὐγούστ(ου) ἡ βασιλική
 μετὰ τῆς στέγης καὶ τῆς κερα-
 μώσεως ἐγένετο διὰ Καλλουστίου
 καὶ Cιλουανοῦ σχο(λαστικῶν) ἀδελφῶν
 παίδων 'Αρσενίου σχο(λαστικοῦ) Cκυθοπολιτῶν
 ἐν ἰνδ(ικτιῶνι) θ' ἐν χρ(όνοις) 'Εντριχίου μεγαλο-
 πρεπεστάτου ἄρχοντος.

³⁴ Translated by di Segni (1999b) 636. The inscription was carefully engraved with decorative elements and crosses. See also Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 116, 120–121.

³⁵ See further, Bar-Nathan and Mazor (1992) 42–44.

³⁶ The basilica was built on the site of an old Roman portico and decorative pool; cf. Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 123–125, especially on the elaborate roofing system and the paving. The remains of the mosaic pavement suggest that the decoration was plants and animals on a white background, similar to that in the portico of the Byzantine agora. For other civil basilicas of this period, see di Segni (1999a) 157. On this Silvanus, who came from a prominent Samaritan family, Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 119, 124–125. His son, named Arsenius after his grandfather, pursued a successful career at the imperial court and succeeded in obtaining a donation from Justin for rebuilding the walls of Scythopolis; Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LXI, Proc. *Anec.* XXVII.8–10, with Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 100–101, n.63–65.

³⁷ Translated by di Segni (1999b) 638.

From ■ grant of emperor Flavius Anastasius Augustus the basilica was built, together with the roof and the roof-tiles, through the brothers Sallustius and Silvanus, Scythopolitan lawyers, sons of Arsenius the lawyer, in the 9th indiction, at the time of the most magnificent governor Entrichius.³⁸

The 9th indiction fell in 500/501 and in 515/516 so either date is possible. At the same time as the construction of the basilica, Silvanus Street, from the central monument to the site of the basilica, was rebuilt at a higher level, thus burying the former Roman street.³⁹ It is likely that the second stage of the building work on the Byzantine agora also belongs to this period.⁴⁰

Building for prestige: churches

All building work carried out with imperial support in funding made for excellent publicity. Construction, particularly on ■ grand and sumptuous scale, indicated ■ healthy economy; and financial aid to building projects, perhaps especially to the more vulnerable provinces, would ensure the gratitude of the inhabitants. Church building also offered the emperor opportunities to promote true faith against paganism or heresy, to glorify imperial power on earth as representative of divine power in heaven, and to satisfy personal egoism and ambition.⁴¹ The second of these purposes, involving the imperial ideology of the emperor as God's representative on earth (God being the creator of all things), evolved from Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*⁴² and was developed by Procopius in his *de Aedificiis*. He sought to show that Justinian was often divinely inspired, particularly concerning St. Sophia and Dara.⁴³ Priscian also used this motif in his panegyric: "God the creator of all has entrusted to you the restoration of the world".⁴⁴

For Anastasius, the first goal was also very relevant, particularly in his later years as he inclined more and more towards monophysitism. It was important that he supported churches and monasteries financially

³⁸ Translated by di Segni (1999b) 639, and Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 124.

³⁹ It is also likely that work was carried out on another street just after 515: for example, basalt blocks were laid in a herringbone pattern; cf. Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 105.

⁴⁰ Cf. Tsafir and Foerster (1997) 116, 122–123.

⁴¹ On the concept of caesaropapism, Geanakoplos (1966) 185–186.

⁴² Euseb. *Vit. Const.* III.

⁴³ Proc. *de Aed.* I.1.21, 25; II.3.1ff. For more discussion on such imperial ideology, see e.g. Downey (1938) 10ff, Armstrong (1969) 28–29, Cameron (1985) 89ff and Coyne (1991) 138.

⁴⁴ *cui Deus omniparens renovandum credidit orbem*. Prisc. *Pan.* 181 (tr. Coyne).

because such support often helped to create or maintain monophysite centres. In his imperial capital, it was vital for him to be seen as a generous church builder, particularly to an increasingly hostile Chalcedonian population.⁴⁵ The fact that, during the 512 Trishagion riot, ■ monk who had lived in the church of St Philip⁴⁶ was killed by the orthodox mob, tends to support the supposition that churches founded by Anastasius were monophysite and remained loyal. It is also interesting that the emperor founded two churches on the sites of houses in which he had previously lived: the church of St. Michael inside the enclosure of St Julian, and the Church of Prodromos (ἐν τῇ Ὁξίῳ). Such foundations were perhaps to underline the link between God and emperor.⁴⁷

Throughout the provinces there are numerous remains of churches dated by inscription to the reign of Anastasius, and often referring to imperial benefaction. Such was the church at Amisa in the province of Hellespont;⁴⁸ and there is also evidence for Anastasius' patronage of churches and monasteries in the Tur 'Abdin. As the 1592 manuscript of the "Histoire du couvent de S. Hanania" revealed:

All the churches of the Tur 'Abdin were built by Anastasius: the dome of the Saffron [monastery] and the temple (hayklo) of Salah and the temple of Mar Abraham at Midyat and the temple of [Mar John of] Kfone and the church ('i(d)to) of Arnas and that of Kfarze and the temple of the monastery of the Cross of Hesno d'Kifo; and the sons of Shufnay were the craftsmen, Theodosius and Theodorus.⁴⁹

The evidence behind such a claim is unknown, but it is probable that the "splendour of the stone work" and the Greek elements at the Saffron monastery point to an injection of imperial funds.⁵⁰

One of the most significant examples of Anastasius' aid is that to the church and monastery complex at Qartmin in the Tur 'Abdin.⁵¹ This was ■ Jacobite foundation, the history of which is contained in two sources: the calendar of the Tur 'Abdin, and the *Lives of Three Saints* which is preserved in at least two Syriac manuscripts. Three occasions of imperial benefaction are recounted: the original foundation by Arcadius and Honorius, and two later gifts, by Theodosius II and

⁴⁵ For a full list of churches, see Capizzi (1969) 196–199, with further details in Janin (1969) *passim*.

⁴⁶ Identified as the church of St. Philip ἐν τῇ Μετριάδου by Capizzi (1969) 197.


⁴⁷ Janin (1969) 343 and 198.

⁴⁸ Reinach (1895) 83–84, Capizzi (1969) 211.

⁴⁹ Tr. Palmer (1990a) 52.

⁵⁰ Palmer (1990a) 123.

⁵¹ General information in Bell (1982) 6ff and 137–139, Capizzi (1969) 221–223.



Anastasios. These sources contain a description of the construction in 512 of the main church, though they leave unclear the reason for Anastasios' generosity. Various conjectures have been proffered. The first concerns the timing with respect to the ending of the Persian war and the construction of Dara. It is thought that John Sa'oro, during whose bishopric the church of the Forty Martyrs at Amida was built, was responsible for instigating the imperial benefaction.⁵² This would mean the work was begun just before 502, was delayed during the war, but then benefited from the influx of fine craftsmen to the area for the building of Dara.

A second conjecture, based on the aniconic nature of the mosaics, leads to a different influence behind the benefaction. Philoxenus, the extreme monophysite bishop of Hierapolis, condemned the "portrayal in corporeal form of incorporeal beings". He is known to have frequented Qartmin. A passage in the *Life of Samuel* reads:

We have found [a passage] concerning this holy abbey in the letter which was sent by the blessed Philoxenus to Eustochios: "To go there seven times in faith is like going to Jerusalem, for it is built in the

likeness and after the pattern of [that city], and it is laid out according to the same design."⁵³

Another section of the *Life of Samuel* reveals that the column of Abel, the styliote at Qartmin, used to bend down, so that the two holy men could embrace.⁵⁴ It has therefore been suggested that the money for the building at Qartmin was part of the largesse organised by Philoxenus to stir up support from monks at the time of Severus' election in Antioch.⁵⁵ Whether initial encouragement rested with John Sa'oro or Philoxenus, Anastasios' benefaction would have ensured the gratitude of the monks concerned, the strengthening of a powerful monophysite establishment close to the Persian border at a critical time, and the enhancing of the reputation of the emperor as the creator of all things on earth.

Between 491 and 518, there is evidence for much church-building activity in northern Syria.⁵⁶ Further south, in c.500, in the region to the west of Antioch on Mount Kasios, a church and monastery were built, dedicated to St. Barlaam. Although a later church was built on the site (post 969), it is clear that it used much decorative material from the first, including walls mosaics, a mixed tesserae and opus sectile floor, and acanthus capitals.⁵⁷

At Bostra in southern Syria, the cathedral of SS Sergius, Bacchus and Leontius was completed in 512, as dated by the inscription found there on the door of the cathedral:

Ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου καὶ ὁσιωτάτου Ἰου[λιανοῦ]
ἐπισκο[ποῦ] ᾧ κο[δο]μήθη καὶ ἐτελιώθη ὁ ἅγιος ναὸς Σεργίου,
βαχχου καὶ Λεοντίου τῶν ἀθλοφόρων καὶ καλ[λι]-
νίκων μαρτύρων ἐν ἔτι υἷ, ἰνδι(κτιῶνος) [ε].

Under the most beloved God and most holy Julian, archbishop, was built and completed the holy church of Sergius, Bacchus and Leontius, martyrs, who received the prize and triumphed gloriously. In the year 407, 6th indiction.

It would be interesting to know the emperor's exact role in or attitude

⁵³ *Life of Sam.* XVIII.8–11 (tr. Palmer (1990a) 115).

⁵⁴ *Life of Sam.* XXII.3–4 cf. Palmer (1990a) 113.

⁵⁵ Cf. Hawkins and Mundell (1973) 294–295.

⁵⁶ Some examples listed by Butler (1969) include the church at Kalôta, 492, p.67; Bâsufân, the church of St. Phocas, pp.67–68; Bâkirhâ, the west church, 501, p.133; Kerrâtîn, the cathedral of St. Stephen, 505, p.158; Zebed, the church of St. Sergius, 512, p.158; the baptistery at Fidreh, 513, p.152; Dâr Kitâ, the baptistery of the church of St. Paul and Moses, 515, p.155; and Busr il-Harîrî, naos of St. Stephen, the Great Church, 517, p.249. On the cathedral of St. Stephen at Kerrâtîn, see also Butler (1920) 73 and Prentice (1908) 76–78.

⁵⁷ See Djobadze (1986) chapter 1.

⁵² John Sa'oro was originally from Qartmin. As bishop of Amida he directed the city through the period of the Arab wars and died just before the beginning of the Persian siege.

towards this project. Soon after the construction of the cathedral its bishop, Julian, whose involvement is credited here, was to be deposed as a Chalcedonian, having refused communion with Severus, patriarch of Antioch. At the time of Severus' consecration, the very pinnacle of monophysite achievement, would Anastasius be supporting the church building activities of a 'heretical' bishop? However, it is not clear whether the cathedral was completed with imperial funds. If Anastasius provided financial aid, then either he did so regardless of doctrinal differences (in the same way as he was prepared to help the monk Sabas⁵⁸), or he acted out of political motivation, hoping for influence or sympathy in a strongly orthodox region. The completion of the church without an imperial benefaction would simply attest to the general prosperity of the region in this period.⁵⁹

In Jordan, there is evidence of a memorial church to St. John the Baptist built on the west bank of the Jordan river, at the place where Jesus' baptism was said to have taken place. Sources indicate that Anastasius founded the church, together with a large monastic complex and several hospices, and that he endowed the monks with an annuity of six *nomismata* per head. Again, it is possible that this funding may have been provided as a result of Urbicius' visit to Palestine and Syria in 505.⁶⁰

Imperial cities

Another popular target for imperial propaganda was the home town of the emperor, which was often embellished. The extent of Anastasius' embellishment of Dyrrhachium, however, is not entirely clear. There is little textual evidence. Malalas mentions that "Anastasius had built many buildings there and had even provided a hippodrome for the inhabitants".⁶¹ There is no archaeological evidence for the hippodrome,

⁵⁸ Cyril of Scythop. *Vit Sab.* LV reports that Sabas was given financial aid for the restoration of the church of SS Cosmas and Damian in Matalasca (Sabas' native village) near Caesarea; cf. Capizzi (1969) 209.

⁵⁹ di Segni (1999a) 167ff provides a list of various building projects in Palestine and Arabia dating to the reign of Anastasius.

⁶⁰ Antonius of Placentia (c.570) 12.136.6–11, and Theodosius *de situ Terrae Sanctae* 20.121.21–28, with Hirschfeld (1992) 16 and di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 265. The latter also refer to the suggestion of S. Vailhé, in *Répertoire alphabétique des monastères de Palestine*, No.132 (*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 5 (1900) 290) that Anastasius awarded a grant for the enlargement of Theognius' monastery in the desert of Judah, and for the construction of a church there; cf. Paul of Elusa, *Vita Theognii*, 11 (*Analecta Bollandiana* 10 (1891) 90–91).

⁶¹ ὅστις καὶ πολλὰ ἔκτισεν ἐκεῖ, παρεσχηκὼς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ ἵπποδρόμον. Mal. 417–

but if he did build one, or merely repaired an existing structure, this would have been a significant indication of the raised status of the city as the birth place of the emperor. Hippodromes, often built adjacent to the palace complex in imperial capitals, had always been used for conspicuous displays of imperial power, especially since the early fourth century.⁶²

There is some indication that Anastasius was responsible for the city walls at Dyrrhachium, although the archaeological evidence is not certain. It is possible that the walls belonged to part of a programme of fortification carried out along the Via Egnatia in the 440s under the direction of the praetorian prefect of Illyricum, Hormisdas. This would date them to the same period as the monumental land walls at Constantinople, started in 412 and completed by Theodosius II.⁶³ However, there are persuasive arguments for attributing the walls to the first half of the sixth century. John of Antioch, followed by the *Souda*, recorded that Anastasius ornamented his own city and surrounded it with a triple crown of walls.⁶⁴ Current excavations have revealed monograms on brickstamps which indicate the later date, although they cannot be dated securely to the reign of Anastasius in particular. They contain the letters NACTIOV, letters which appear in the names of both Anastasius and Justinian.⁶⁵ The various Christian symbols used (crosses, olive branches, dolphins) were also employed by both Anastasius and Justinian, and so again it is not possible to date the monograms accurately by style to one particular emperor. They therefore provide evidence only of official production for use in a state-sponsored building project. However, if Anastasius was responsible for the construction of the walls, he may have been prompted by more than just loyalty and nostalgia for his former home town. Dyrrhachium held a strategic location in the Balkans: a key point on both land and sea

418 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott); Niceph. Cal. XVI.25; Valentini (1957) II.41, 308 and 338, Capizzi (1969) 206.

⁶² Cf. Gutteridge (forthcoming).

⁶³ Gutteridge, Hoti and Hurst (2001) 397–398, 405ff.

⁶⁴ John of Ant. fr.215 (*FGH* IV.621); *Souda* s.v. *Anastasius* 2077. Eutychius of Alexandria (*Annales* 10), writing in the first half of the tenth century, noted that Anastasius constructed a city wall and other buildings in his home town of Hama. Gutteridge (forthcoming) argues that although Eutychios is clearly confused as to the name and location of Anastasius' native city, he provides evidence that there was a tradition associating Anastasius with the construction of a wall at his native city. The reference by Malchus (fragment 20) to the city walls of Dyrrhachium pre-479 does not rule out construction by Anastasius. There is evidence of an earlier circuit dating from the early imperial period, and it may be that Anastasius strengthened the walls after the reported occupation of the city by Theoderic in 479; cf. Gutteridge (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ There is evidence from Procopius *de Aed.* IV.4 that Justinian built a new fort at Dyrrhachium.

routes, it had an important harbour.⁶⁶ In the fifth and sixth centuries, when the Balkans suffered raids and even sporadic occupation by a succession of barbarian tribes, the city fell to the Pannonian Goths in 459 and 479, and was threatened by the Slavs in 548. At the same time, as the courts of Constantinople and Ravenna were vying for power in various regions (demonstrated by, for example, Theoderic's incursion into Illyricum and his seizure of Sirmium in 504), Dyrrhachium became an increasingly critical centre for Byzantine control.⁶⁷ It may, therefore, be significant that not only was Dyrrhachium protected by a circuit of walls, but that the walls were built entirely of brick, with no concrete or rubble core.⁶⁸ The use of brick alone was reminiscent of the walls built by Aurelian at Rome and signified the power or even the presence of the emperor.⁶⁹ It is likely that by this period manufacture of brick would have been under state control, so the erection of a brick-built wall sent a message not only of physical security, but of imperial wealth and control. The powerfully threatening prow-shaped pentagonal towers, which were associated with imperial-sponsored fortifications, would have added to this image of imperial strength and presence. Thus Anastasius may well have been demonstrating the extent of imperial power in the troubled Balkans as much as he was showing favour to what had been his home town.⁷⁰

Finally, a common method of publicising imperial munificence to a particular city was to name it after the emperor himself. Dara and Resafa both became known as Anastasiopolis⁷¹ and the *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique* lists a further six in various provinces of the empire.⁷²

* * *

Capizzi's catalogue of Anastasius' building achievements contains sixty-four separate entries and, even though incomplete, reveals a wide range: from renaming cities to building churches to dredging harbours. In his panegyric, Priscian seeks to create an impression of a limitless number of projects, which is in keeping with the idea of Anastasius as

the "restorer of the world".⁷³ However, it could be argued that such a building policy was hardly in keeping with an impression of Anastasius as a careful and cautious financier, eager to preserve and build up the imperial treasury. There are several points to make in answer to this apparent dichotomy. Firstly, defensive fortifications were obviously necessary for the safety and preservation of the frontiers, and additional civic amenities were just as important in retaining the loyalty of border populations. Secondly, it is clear that while many of the utilitarian measures, such as improvements to harbours and the repairing of the Alexandrian lighthouse, required initial outlay, they were vital to ensure the continuation and prosperity of trade and the empire's economy. Thirdly, while sumptuous church building and decoration may seem a waste of fiscal resources, imperial largesse was rarely without some benefit.⁷⁴ As his reign coincided with and provoked such bitter doctrinal disputes, it was particularly important for Anastasius to be seen as a benefactor to religious institutions, both to strengthen his position as God's viceregent on earth, and to promote his own monophysite cause.

⁷³ Coyne (1991) 140.

⁷⁴ di Segni and Hirschfeld (1986) 265 also note the benefit of imperial aid to building work that was not strictly utilitarian, such as baths. The hot springs at Hammat Gader, for example, were well known for their healing powers.

⁶⁶ Cf. Gutteridge (forthcoming).

⁶⁷ As was noted in ch. 4, pp.109–114, there is increasing evidence of Anastasius' attention to defences in the Balkans.

⁶⁸ Cf. Gutteridge, Hoti, Hurst (2001) 395–396 and Gutteridge (forthcoming).

⁶⁹ The use of brick in fortifications was normally restricted to a number of horizontal bands as at Constantinople and Thessalonica.

⁷⁰ Cf. Gutteridge (forthcoming).

⁷¹ Cf. ch. 3, pp.37, 69.

⁷² Pétridès (1914) cols.1489–1491, with Capizzi (1969) 204–205, 210, 211–212.

8

ANASTASIUS' LEGACY

The reign of Anastasius came to an end with his death on the night of 8th/9th July, 518.¹ At the advanced age of almost ninety, it might be assumed that Anastasius had succumbed to natural causes, but rumour circulated that ■ bolt of lightning had struck the imperial palace, terrifying the elderly emperor and hastening his death.² Thunder and lightning were considered signs of divine punishment for the heretical (in his case, monophysite) views pursued by Anastasius, although it is, of course, perfectly possible that a storm did rage over Constantinople on that July evening in 518.³ More difficult to ground in reality is a tale of dreams and prophecies recorded by Malalas and copied in turn by the anonymous writer of the *Chronicon Paschale*, by Theophanes and by Cedrenus: "A short time later the emperor Anastasius saw, in a dream, an elegant, full grown man standing in front of him. He was carrying a book with writing in it, which he was reading. He turned over five pages, read out the emperor's name and said to him, 'See, because of your insatiability, I am erasing 14'. And with his finger, he erased them". It seems that when Anastasius summoned Amantius, his *cubicularius* and *praepositus*, hoping for comfort, Amantius had his own dream to report: "I too have had a dream tonight that I was standing facing your majesty, and from behind me a pig, as big as a wild boar, came up and seized the edge of my cloak in its mouth, shook me and pulled me to the ground and killed me by trampling on me and devouring me". Proclus, the philosopher from Asia, explained that

these dreams presaged the deaths of both Anastasius and Amantius.⁴ This story is remarkable since it suggests that had Anastasius not been denied his last fourteen years, he would have lived to the age of one hundred and four.

Where there was confusion, uncertainty and perhaps even fear at the time of succession, it was natural that dreams, prophecies and rumours should become significant. Certainly some might have felt the need for explanation and justification for the election of Justin, a Thracian peasant who had risen through the ranks to become count of the excubitors, the palace guards. Anastasius is often criticised for having made no provision for a successor. It is true that he might have considered nominating Hypatius, the most senior of his three nephews, as his successor, or even appointing him co-emperor.⁵ However, he might have balked at arranging ■ successor whose theological views were not clearly monophysite, or he may have considered that Hypatius' military defeats would not make him a popular choice.⁶ At the time of Anastasius' death in July 518, Hypatius, as *magister militum per Orientem*, appears to have been in Antioch and well out of contention. It should also be remembered that at this time the throne was not automatically in the gift of the current emperor. After all, Zeno's attempt to groom his brother Longinus for the throne had been brushed aside when Anastasius became emperor. As we saw then, effective power of election lay with the people, the senate and the army.

The chain of events that led to the crowning of Justin is complex and confused, involving scuffles between the troops of Celer (the *magister officiorum*) and Justin himself. Various candidates were suggested to

⁴ μετά δὲ ὀλίγον καιρὸν εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος ὅτι ἔσται ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ἀνὴρ τις τέλειος, εὐσχήμων, βαστάζων κώδικα γεγραμμένον, καὶ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ ἀναπτύξας τοῦ κώδικος φύλλα πέντε καὶ ἀναγνοὺς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὄνομα εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἴδε, διὰ τὴν ἀπληστίαν σου ἀπαλείψω δεκατέσσαρα· καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ δακτύλῳ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλειψε, φησί ... ἐνὺπνιον γὰρ εἶδον κἀγὼ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ὅτι ὡς ἔστηκώς κἀγὼ ἐναντίον τοῦ ὑμετέρου κράτους ὀπισθέν μου ἐλθὼν χοῖρος, ὥσπερ σύαγρος μέγας, καὶ δραξάμενος τῷ στόματι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς χλαμύδος καὶ τινάξας κατήγαγέ με εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀνήλωσέ με κατεσθίων καὶ καταπατῶν. Mal. 408–409 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott); *Chron. Pasch.* 518, Theoph. AM 6010, Cedr. 635–636. It is interesting that the charge of Anastasius' wrongdoing changes from ἀπληστία (insatiability or greed) in Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale* to κακοπιστία (heresy or erroneous beliefs) in Theophanes and Cedrenus who were generally more critical of Anastasius' religious policy.

⁵ For discussion of Probus and Pompeius, see Greatrex (1996) 129–130.

⁶ On Hypatius' doctrinal views, Greatrex (1996) passim. He suggests that Hypatius' support changed from pro-monophysitism to pro-Chalcedonianism after 516. That popular opinion had clearly swung in his favour by the time of the *Nika* riot in 532 when he was proclaimed emperor does not mean that his succession in 518 would have been acceptable.

¹ Theoph. AM 6010 records the date wrongly as 9th April, 518.

² Anastasius' death is recorded variously: Mal. 499 and *Chron. Pasch.* 518 report he was ninety years and five months; Theod. Lect. 524 and Jord. Rom. 359 calculate that he was eighty-eight; John of Nikiu LXXXIX.93 observed that he fell ill and died when he was ninety. Anastasius' death during ■ thunderstorm is described by Mal. 499, *Chron. Pasch.* 518, Theoph. AM 6010 and Cedr. 635–636.

³ Evagrius (III.44) may have deliberately avoided mentioning the thunderstorm because of the unfavourable associations; cf. Whitby (2000) 196, n.178.

the impatient crowds massing in the hippodrome but were rejected with increasing violence. Eventually, the senate, alarmed by the threats of the mob whipped up by the factions, agreed on Justin, and even though disturbances continued, the choice of the senate, with the approval of the army and the demes, was upheld.⁷ Contemporaries, however, professed astonishment at the choice. Evagrius recorded that Justin “acquired the monarchical rule contrary to all expectation”⁸ and a rumour began to circulate that for his own campaign Justin had used money provided by Amantius, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, for the promotion of Theocritus, the *comes domesticorum*.⁹ Against such a hostile background, confirmation of early signs of Justin’s greatness was sought in dreams and prophecies from the reign of Anastasius. Procopius recorded in the *Secret History* that during the Isaurian war, John the Hunchback had imprisoned Justin and was intending to kill him the following day, but was prevented by a vivid dream: “For the General declared that in a dream a certain person came to him, a creature of enormous size and in other respects too mighty to resemble a man. And this vision enjoined upon him to release the man whom he had chanced to imprison on that day ...”. This vision appeared again, and on the third occasion, “the vision stood over him and threatened him with a terrible fate if he should fail to carry out the instructions, and added that when he in later times should become exceedingly angry, he would have need of this man and his family”.¹⁰ A second prophecy documented by the Anonymus Valesianus records that Anastasius invited his three nephews to lunch and placed the symbol of royalty under the pillow on one of the three couches prepared for their midday siesta. Since two of them shared one couch, it happened that none of the nephews slept on the couch with the symbol of royalty. Anastasius, therefore, asked God to reveal to him the name of his successor. A man appeared to him in a dream and told him that whoever was announced first in his bedchamber the next day would succeed to the throne. Naturally it was Justin who was announced first

the following morning.¹¹

However, Justin’s accession may not have been contrary to all expectation. Evagrius and Procopius might refer to the distinguished relatives of Anastasius who were forced aside, but Hypatius was overseas, and the other two nephews, although they had both held consulships, had never been at the forefront of the imperial court. Other powerful figures such as Celer and Patricius were very much associated with the policies (especially religious) of the Anastasian regime. Although Justin’s peasant origins may not have appealed to the ministers and the senate, in other respects he had much to offer: indeed his humble origins would have won him the sympathy of the people, his military career the support of the army; and his orthodoxy the favour of the pro-Chalcedonian capital. His role in the defeat of Vitalian in the Golden Horn, celebrated in the account of John of Antioch, would have enhanced his popular standing.¹² Finally, his position as count of the palace guards, the *excubitors*, who would fight if necessary (as opposed to the ornamental palace guards under the command of Celer), gave Justin a practical advantage over any potential rivals.¹³

Justin also had the benefit of advice and support from his nephews whose careers he had himself promoted. Germanus would become a successful general and marry Matasuntha, the grand-daughter of Theodoric, but it was another nephew, born Petrus Sabbatius, who would become Justin’s designated heir, calling himself Flavius Petrus Sabbatius Justinianus. It is not clear to what extent Justinian directed the government of the empire under his uncle’s name from 518 until 527 when after Justin’s death he assumed sole rule, but it may be assumed that his influence was extremely powerful.

Justin and Justinian inherited from Anastasius an empire which enjoyed, on the whole, greater stability and security than it had in the late fifth century. Of the key issues affecting the empire at Anastasius’ succession, the Isaurian problem had been resolved and the economy was flourishing. On the other hand, differences in doctrine had not been settled, and clearly the most dramatic U-turn in imperial government after Anastasius was the change in religious policy. Again, it is not known whether Justinian was directing his uncle Justin’s policy with a view to his later reconquest of the west, but in any case a rapprochement with the papacy and the Church of Rome would be essential for

¹¹ Anon. Val. 74–76; Vasiliev (1950) 88.

¹² Cf. John of Ant. fr.214, contra Mal. 404; see discussion in ch.5, n.308, with Greatrex (1996) 134–135.

¹³ Cf. Browning (1971) 19.

⁷ For this account, see *de Cer.* I.93, with e.g. Vasiliev (1950) 68ff and Browning (1971) 19ff.

⁸ περιέθετο δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν αὐτοκράτορα πάσης ὑπέρτερον ἐλπίδος, Evag. IV.1 (tr. Whitby). He and Proc. I.11.1 both refer to the many distinguished relatives of Anastasius who were forced aside by Justin.

⁹ For the primary sources and comment, Vasiliev (1950) 81–82, n.61.

¹⁰ ἔφη γὰρ οἱ ἐν ὀνείρῳ ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐντυχεῖν τινα παμμεγέθη τε τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὰλλα κρείσσω ἢ ἀνθρώπῳ εἰκάζεσθαι. καὶ τὸν μὲν οἱ ἐπισκῆψαν μεθεῖναι τὸν ἄνδρα ὄνπερ καθεῖρξας ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ... τρίτον δὲ οἱ ἐπιστάσαν τὴν τοῦ ὀνείρου ὄψιν ἀπειλήσαι μὲν τὰ ἀνήκεστα, ἢν μὴ τὰ ἐπηγγελμένα ποιοίη. ἐπειπεῖν τε ὡς αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῆς συγγενείας χρέος οἱ μέγα ὀργισθησόμενῳ ἕς χρόνον τὸν ὀπισθεν εἶη. Proc. *Anec.* VI.6–9 (tr. Dewing).

any pro-Chalcedonian court. Hormisdas, when he saw that the patriarch of Constantinople, Timothy, had been forced to renounce his monophysite beliefs and that synods held in the capital, in Jerusalem, in Tyre and in Apamea not only embraced the Chalcedonian definition of faith but at the same time ordered the expulsion of monophysite bishops and clergy and the recall of the orthodox in their place, accepted the proffered reconciliation from Justin and Justinian.¹⁴ His only complaint was that Egypt, led by its patriarch, Timothy IV, remained a monophysite stronghold and offered asylum to many leading monophysites, including Severus of Antioch. But Justin knew that he could not upset Egypt, which still provided the bulk of the grain supply for Constantinople. The new policy was successful, at least at first, in establishing pro-Chalcedonian orthodoxy in eastern provinces, such as Syria, which had previously harboured influential pockets of monophysitism. However, as noted at the end of chapter five, although Justinian strove throughout his reign to find a means of uniting the Chalcedonians and the monophysites, the founding of a separate monophysite (i.e. Jacobite) church indicates his lack of success. It should also be noted that Anastasius did not indulge in imperially directed persecutions, while there is evidence to suggest disruption on the eastern frontier caused by the rejection of monophysites in the early 520s.¹⁵ Interestingly, Vitalian, who had challenged Anastasius' rule in the name of orthodoxy, was recalled to the capital. However, according to Malalas, in 520 he "was put to death in the palace" ostensibly "for having rebelled against the Romans and for having plundered many cities and territories of the Roman state"; presumably his influential popularity made him too great a rival for Justinian.¹⁶

The change in religious policy also affected foreign policy. The ending of the Acacian schism brought a positive end to the ambiguity of the Ostrogothic position in Italy which some may have felt Theoderic had been able to exploit while the papacy remained estranged from the Constantinopolitan church. Theoderic recognised the sovereignty of Justin whilst ensuring, in practice, the rule of Italy for himself and his heirs; his son-in-law, Eutharic, was adopted by Justin

as his son-at-arms, and they shared the consulship in 519.¹⁷ After years of uneasy negotiations between Anastasius, Theoderic, the Roman senate and the papacy, the ending of the Acacian schism and the formalisation of the Ostrogothic position in Italy would have seemed a triumph to be celebrated by the new regime. However, with the death of Eutharic, it appeared that the Ostrogothic hold over Italy was not as comfortable as Theoderic (or indeed Justin and Justinian) might have supposed. Letters intercepted from leading senators in Rome to Constantinople suggested disaffection, and led to the infamous executions of Boethius and Symmachus, while the death of Theoderic in 526 hastened the decline of the Ostrogothic kingdom in the hands of Amalasuntha, Athalaric and Theodahad. The executions of Boethius and Symmachus helped to deflect the loyalty of the senate from the otherwise tolerant Ostrogothic regime, and only a short time later the divisions among the Ostrogoths themselves over Theoderic's succession and in particular, Theodahad's murder of the pro-Roman Amalasuntha, would furnish Justinian with a pretext for the invasion of Italy.¹⁸ His ideological plan to recover the heart of the old Roman Empire is clearly a massive swing away from Anastasius' conservative policy of establishing a *modus vivendi* with Theoderic, while at the same time seeking to contain Ostrogothic power with a show of diplomatic alliances with his western neighbours, the Franks and Burgundians. Impressive military success, at least initially, in Africa and Italy, fanned by propaganda, gave Justinian an aura of glamour and prestige not enjoyed by Anastasius, though arguably it was during the latter's reign that the empire enjoyed the greater degree of peace and stability.

With regard to foreign policy in the east, Anastasius looked to secure alliances with the Arab tribes to offset the Persian threat, and to protect lucrative trade routes from the east. Interest in the Red Sea area continued in the 520s and 530s with Justinian promoting the spread of Christianity to encourage loyalty to Rome and the safeguarding of the trade routes with China and India against Persian interests.¹⁹ As for Persia, the peace treaty signed in 506 continued more or less unbroken for about twenty years, with the Persians preoccupied with internal problems and no doubt deterred by the new Roman fortification programme, initiated by Anastasius.²⁰ Tension remained between the two empires, however, and specific triggers such as the annexing of

¹⁴ On the ending of the Acacian schism, see e.g. Moorhead (1992) 194ff. It would be impossible to imagine the intransigent Euphemius accepting jurisdiction from Rome at the beginning of the 490s.

¹⁵ The anti-Chalcedonians were harassed by imperial forces, "who oppressed them everywhere and mercilessly drove them from one place to another"; cf. Ps. Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 837 (tr. Witakowski), with Greatrex (1998) 131f, n.33.

¹⁶ ἐσφάγη ὁ αὐτὸς Βιταλιανὸς ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ, ὡς τυραννίῃσας Ῥωμαίους καὶ πολλὰς πόλεις καὶ χώρας τῆς Ῥωμανίας πραιδεύσας. Mal. 412 (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott), with Vasiliev (1950) 108–114.

¹⁷ Cf. Moorhead (1992) 201–202.

¹⁸ Cf. Moorhead (1992) 212ff.

¹⁹ For a full discussion of Justinian's policy in southern Arabia, see Greatrex (1998) 225–239.

²⁰ Cf. Greatrex (1998) 131.

Lazica by the Romans in 522 and the rejection of Kavadh's request that his son Chosroes should be adopted by Justin as his son, contributed to ■ climate of mistrust which eventually led to a Persian incursion into Iberia in 527 and ■ Roman raid into Armenia in the same year.²¹ Although it seems that the Roman alliance with the Kindites did not endure, it is apparent that Justinian continued Anastasius' alliance with the Ghassanids. In 528, there are reports of action by a joint Roman-Ghassanid force and in 529, the Ghassanid chief, al-Harith, was made supreme phylarch in order to better coordinate the other phylarchies against the powerful pro-Persian Lakhmid, al-Mundhir. It is clear, therefore, that in key areas of government, economic and diplomatic, Justinian continued Anastasius' policies on the eastern frontier. He also sustained and developed Anastasius' improvements to fortifications both in the east and in the Balkans.²²

In terms of the state economy, the huge reserves inherited by Justin and Justinian provided the means to finance their various projects in at least the early years: for example, the operations against the Persians, and the grandiose building projects in the capital (notably a new cistern, and several churches including SS Sergius and Bacchus). If the reputation of Anastasius' economic policy had been tarnished by the greed and extortion of Marinus, such abuse was mild compared with that exercised by Justinian's praetorian prefect, John the Cappadocian, whose deposition was called for during the *Nika* riot.²³ Generally, the reigns of both Anastasius and Justinian witnessed ■ rise in factional violence. Anastasius, however, sought to introduce policies to limit occasions for rioting, and later unrest was not factional in origin but sparked by theological differences. On the other hand, Justinian's handling of the factional disturbance in 532 led to the death of thirty thousand citizens, the destruction of a large part of the centre of Constantinople and the temporary loss of his throne. Without doubt, Anastasius' delicate handling of the factions throughout his reign deserves more recognition than is usually accorded to him.²⁴

²¹ For details on Lazica, see Greatrex (1998) 132f; on Kavadh's request, *ibid.* 134–136; and for a detailed discussion on the renewal of the conflict, *ibid.* 139ff.

²² As discussed in ch. 3, p.65, and ch. 4, p.109, Justinian enjoys Procopius' praise for many works which were instigated by his predecessor.

²³ On Marinus, see John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.46, 49 and Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LIV; on John the Cappadocian, see e.g. Proc. *B.P.* I.14.11–15; Browning (1971) 68–69 and Cameron (1976) 102–103, 273, 279.

²⁴ Greatrex (1997) 69 notes that the *Nika* riot came about because of the unwise policy of Justinian who "trode an unfortunate middle course between acquiescing in the demands of the factions and sending in the troops". He argues (p.83) that the *Nika* riot was only atypical in the severity of its suppression and suggests that "had Anastasius ever shown such hesitation, he too could have been unseated".

Overall, although the empire was still troubled by doctrinal schisms, it must be recognised that the opportunities for the ambitious projects of Justinian would have been severely limited without the full treasury, the tightly ordered infrastructure and the secure borders which he inherited from the reign of Anastasius.

Appendix A

Notes on the Primary Sources¹

Greek Sources: the Chronicles

Malalas. Chronicles, widely regarded until recently as “the lowest level of historical analysis”, are now increasingly viewed as perfectly respectable forms of historical writing.² Useful contemporary information about Anastasius can be found in the chronicle of John Malalas, whose purpose in writing is set out in his prologue: “... to relate as truthfully as possible a summary account of events that took place in the time of the emperors, up till the events of my own life-time which came to my hearing, I mean indeed from Adam to the reign of Zeno and those who ruled afterwards”.³ It appears that Malalas was born in the 480s–490s, and from the reign of Zeno onwards he was able to use oral sources, his own personal experience and current documents such as imperial laws, decrees and letters.⁴ From the Syriac root ‘mll’ (from which ‘Malalas’ is derived) meaning ‘rhetor’ and from Evagrius’ reference to him as “John the rhetor”, it seems that Malalas was relatively well educated and followed ■ bureaucratic career, first at

¹ References to historical events are also found in literary sources; the panegyrics of Procopius (for French translation and discussion, see Chauvot (1986)) and Priscian (for French translation and discussion, Chauvot (1986) and for English translation and commentary, Coyne (1991)), and the poems attributed to Christodorus of Coptus preserved in the *Anthologia Graeca* (II, IX.210 and IX.656; text and translation, Paton (1927)). On the dating of the panegyrics of Procopius and Priscian, see Appendix B.

² Browning (1987) 179, contra Croke 27, in Jeffreys et al. (1990), Croke and Emmett (1983) 116, Muhlberger (1990) 2ff.

³ ... ἐκθέσαι σοι μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας τὰ συμβάντα ἐν μέρει ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν βασιλέων ἕως τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἐν τοῖς ἑμοῖς χρόνοις ἐλθόντων εἰς τὰς ἡμᾶς ἀκοάς, λέγω δὴ ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Ζήνωνος καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς βασιλευσάντων. (tr. Jeffreys, Jeffreys and Scott). Jeffreys et al. (1986) xxii quote some of the criticisms usually levelled at Malalas: for example, that of Vasiliev (1958): “Confused in content, mixing fables and facts, important events and minor incidents, it is clearly intended not for educated readers but for the masses”. Jeffreys et al. argue that “such judgements fail to understand the extent to which Malalas was conditioned by contemporary knowledge and interpretation ...”. That the chronicle is full of the anecdotal and remarkable with no rhetorical speeches, descriptive passages and colloquial language, would have made it entertaining and attractive, but it is not an indication of Malalas’ incompetence; cf. Browning in *DMA* (1983) II.512. For the text of John Malalas, book XVI, see Dindorf (1831), and the fragments published by Mommsen (1872); and for the translation, E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott (1986).

⁴ For discussion on Malalas’ dates, Jeffreys et al. (1990) 3–4.

Antioch, probably in the office of the *comes orientis*, and later in Constantinople.⁵

The chronicle focuses on events at Antioch, but the archives in the office of the *comes orientis*, to which Malalas arguably had access, offered information relating to the whole of the East, including the Isaurian war, the building of Dara and the earthquake at Rhodes.⁶ More importantly, Malalas provides eyewitness accounts.⁷ The alternation of his style between brief annalistic entries and fuller narrative sections reveals where Malalas has either been present himself or has used an informant. The detailed report on Vitalian's rebellion in 513 and the conversation between the emperor, Marinus and Proclus probably came from Marinus the Syrian himself.⁸ Malalas may have met Marinus, a fellow Syrian, on moving to Constantinople; they both moved in bureaucratic circles.⁹ Malalas' account of the riot at Constantinople which followed the Trishagion controversy is also centred on Marinus.¹⁰ Regarding religious outlook, Malalas does not allow this to determine the tone of his chronicle. Because he does not openly condemn the Trishagion in 512, nor indicate a religious motive for Vitalian's rebellion, he is sometimes regarded as a monophysite.¹¹ However, it has been clearly argued that Malalas was orthodox, and in any case, more interested in presenting simple, factual accounts, rather than dwelling on the religious aspects.¹²

Eustathius of Epiphaneia. The only source that Malalas cites in his section on Anastasius is that of Eustathius of Epiphaneia.¹³ He produced a universal history (no longer extant), which spanned the years from the Trojan war to the reign of Anastasius, ending with the siege of Amida in 502–3. Although it seems he summarised sections from a wide range of Roman historians for the early part of his chronicle, it is probable that, being a contemporary of Anastasius, his account of the period is fairly accurate. Eustathius was also used as a source by Procopius (for the siege of Amida), Evagrius (who praised

him highly), Joshua the Stylite, Theodore Lector and Theophanes.¹⁴

John of Antioch. The *ιστορία χρονική* of John of Antioch survives only in fragments, preserved through the excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.¹⁵ The work was a world chronicle from Adam to Heraclius in 610, but there is a significant stylistic break between the extracts covering the period up to Anastasius, which were written in classical Greek, and the few surviving fragments from 518 to 610, which were composed in more colloquial language. It has been concluded that the manuscript used by Constantine's excerptors was in two parts: a main section in classical Greek up to 518 and then a continuation in vulgar Greek. It is impossible to know if John of Antioch was the author of one or both of the sections, or merely the compiler.¹⁶

The chronicle includes a comprehensive account of the Isaurian war and the revolt of Vitalian, and mentions the rioting in Constantinople which broke out soon after Anastasius' accession and at the Brytae festival in 502. From the nature of the detail recorded concerning the revolt of Vitalian, it seems likely that the chronicle was composed soon after 518.¹⁷ The command of the imperial forces opposing the third attack of Vitalian is attributed to the new emperor, Justin, rather than Marinus. That the account is fairly discreet and no blame is attached to Vitalian (Anastasius' cancellation of supplies to the troops is ostensibly the reason for the uprising) might be because Vitalian was back in power.¹⁸

Chronicon Paschale. The anonymous *Chronicon Paschale* was composed at the beginning of the seventh century.¹⁹ The author concentrated on Constantinopolitan events such as natural disasters, riots, building works and news of military achievements. However, his prime interest in religious affairs is an indication of a career in the ecclesiastical bureaucracy where he would have had access to official records and documents.²⁰ For Anastasius' period, the *Chronicle* presents incorrect chronology, and as he follows Malalas almost exclusively adds no new evidence. The names of the consuls are confused twice (493–4 and 501), the account of the building of Dara is obviously misdated

⁵ Jeffreys et al. (1990) 11.

⁶ Mal. on the Isaurians, 393–4; Dara, 399; the earthquake, 406.

⁷ For example, Mal. on John Isthmeos, 395; the 507 AD riot and the basilica of Rufinus, 395–8; and the Persian war, 398–9.

⁸ Mal. 402–6.

⁹ *PLRE* II.726–8, Marinus 7; Jeffreys et al. (1990) 209.

¹⁰ Mal. 406–8.

¹¹ As argued by Černousov (1926) 68ff.

¹² For a detailed discussion on Malalas and his religious views, see Jeffreys et al. (1990) 11ff, esp. 16.

¹³ Fragments edited by Müller (1851). Eustathius is mentioned by Mal. 399, Evag. I.19; II.15; III.26, 29, 37; V.24, and the *Souda* s.v. *Eustathius* 3746. For further details, see Allen (1988).

¹⁴ Cf. Allen (1988) 3. On Evagrius' use of Eustathius, Whitby (2000) 162, n.84, and on Theodore Lector, Hansen (1971) xviii–xix.

¹⁵ Edited by Müller (1851 and 1870), and the fragments published by Mommsen (1872); for comments see *ODB* II.1062; Jeffreys et al. (1986) xxxv; (1990) 251–2, and 331–4.

¹⁶ Mango (1990) 12–14.

¹⁷ John of Ant. fr.214e.

¹⁸ Marcellinus *Comes* 519.3 also attributes no blame to the reinstated Vitalian.

¹⁹ Text edited by Dindorf (1832), and partially translated by L.M. and M. Whitby (1989).

²⁰ L.M. and M. Whitby (1989) xxvii–xxviii.

(498 instead of 507), and the 512 rioting is misplaced and dated to 517.²¹

Theophanes the Confessor. The ninth-century Theophanes continued the chronicle of George Syncellus.²² For the Anastasian period, he uses contemporary fifth- and sixth-century sources: Eustathius of Epiphania for the Isaurian revolt and Persian war, and Theodore Lector for ecclesiastical events and the Persian war.²³ For Vitalian's revolt, Theophanes follows both Theodore Lector and Malalas and his account is rather muddled: he dates the beginning of the trouble to 513 (usually dated to 514), and he confuses Hypatius, the *magister militum per Thracias*, with Hypatius, the nephew of the emperor. His entry for the years 514/515 consists of either a misplaced description of the second confrontation or an approximate account of the third battle. Theophanes' bias against Anastasius (for his monophysitism) is clear throughout his account: for example "The most orthodox Euphemius drove out of Church the *silentarius* Anastasius, the one who subsequently ruled wickedly as emperor, for being a heretic ...".²⁴

George Monachus. George Monachus, also belonging to the ninth century, produced a chronicle covering the period from the Creation to the death of the emperor Theophilus in 842, and concentrating mainly on ecclesiastical history.²⁵ There are lengthy sections on the riots following the introduction of the monophysite Trishagion and the early relationship between Euphemius and Anastasius; and the Isaurian revolt is included as a prelude to Euphemius' deposition.²⁶ Snippets of other information from Malalas or Theophanes, such as the incursion of the Sabir Huns, are also added.²⁷

²¹ *Chron. Pasch.* 517, contra Marc. C. 512, cf. Mal. 406–8. Mal. puts the 512 rioting (undated) just before Anastasius' vision of 518, which has obviously confused the author of the *Chronicon Paschale*.

²² Text edited by de Boor (1883), vol. I, and tr. Mango and Scott (1997). For detailed arguments on proportions of the chronicle attributed to Theophanes and George Syncellus, see Mango (1978) 9ff, Jeffreys et al. (1990) 41, and Mango and Scott (1997) lii–liiii. For a summary of views on Theophanes' sources, see the *ODB* III.2063.

²³ Theoph. AM 5996–5998. For Theophanes' use of Procopius for the Persian war, see Mango and Scott (1997) lxxxi, xciiif.

²⁴ Εὐφύμιος δὲ ὁ ὀρθοδόξωτατος Ἀναστάσιον τὸν σιλεντάριον τὸν κακῶς μετὰ ταῦτα βασιλεύσαντα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐδίωκεν, ὡς αἰρετικόν ... Theoph. AM 5982 (tr. Mango and Scott). For the problems inherent in Theophanes' text, see Browning (1983) 513 and his treatment of the sources, Mango and Scott (1997) xci–xcv.

²⁵ Text edited by de Boor (1904), and revised Wirth (1978).

²⁶ On the Trishagion, 620–1; and Euphemius and the Isaurians, 623–5.

²⁷ On the Huns, 622. For further information on George Monachus, see the *ODB* II.836, Smith (1880) II.251, Kazhdan in *DMA* (1985) V.401–402, and Jeffreys et al. (1986) xxxiv and (1990) 45f.

Cedrenus and Zonaras. From the twelfth century survive the chronicles of the monk, George Cedrenus, and the court official, John Zonaras.²⁸ Their accounts contain no new information but are merely conglomerations of earlier sources. Zonaras, covering a wide range of material from Anastasius' reign including doctrinal issues, legislation, administration and foreign policy, is generally reckoned to be fairly accurate;²⁹ despite the criticism against Cedrenus that he was deficient in historical knowledge and showed a great lack of judgement,³⁰ his chronology is actually fairly good. He tends to follow Malalas (and the *Chronicon Paschale*) closely.³¹

Nicephorus. An even later chronicle source is that produced by the fourteenth-century historian, Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos.³² He gives a relatively full account of Anastasius' reign, focusing particularly on church matters, but also on the Isaurian revolt, the Persian war, Vitalian, administration and building projects. For this period he follows Evagrius.³³

Greek Sources: the Ecclesiastical Histories

Evagrius. The ecclesiastical history of Evagrius is an important authority for the reign of Anastasius.³⁴ After teaching in Constantinople, he returned to Antioch to practise law, where he and John Scholasticus became the legal advisers of Gregory, the patriarch of Antioch. His interest in Persian affairs probably sprang from the latter's involvement. He wrote an ecclesiastical history (428 to 594), in which, despite his aim to justify Chalcedonian orthodoxy and refute the recently published history of the monophysite Zachariah, he is perhaps surprisingly moderate in his views and portrayal of events; he still admired Anastasius' piety and constant search for peaceful solutions.³⁵

²⁸ The text of Cedrenus is edited by Bekker (1838–1839); that of Zonaras by Pindar and Büttner-Wobst (1841–1897).

²⁹ See the *ODB* III.2229, Smith (1880) III.1331, Kazhdan in *DMA* (1989) XII.745–746, and Jeffreys et al. (1990) 47.

³⁰ Smith (1880) I.658.

³¹ For example, on Dara, Cedr. 630 cf. Mal. 399 (*Chron. Pasch.* 498), and on Anastasius' vision, Cedr. 635–6 cf. Mal. 408–9 (*Chron. Pasch.* 518).

³² The text (book XVI, chapters 24–45) is edited by Migne (1865).

³³ See Smith (1880) II.1180–1181 for a discussion on the value of Nicephorus as a historian.

³⁴ For the text, Bidez and Parmentier (1898); text, translation and commentary, Whitby (2000); full study on Evagrius, Allen (1981). Evagrius was born some time between 532 and 537, and was therefore writing during the second half of the sixth century.

³⁵ Evag. III.34. His account nevertheless contains some anomalies: for example, contrast his opinion with that of Theodore Lector on Celer (III.32 cf. 487ff, with Whitby (2000) 173,

He paid close attention to the primary texts, mainly Eustathius, Joshua, Malalas and Procopius, and his position gave him access to official documents such as the patriarchal archives of Antioch. Occasionally, he provides our only source for certain letters.

However, the history has no chronological framework. Events are dealt with thematically, secular or religious, and even then taken out of order. The abolition of the *chrysargyron* (498) is placed after the Persian wars (502–5),³⁶ and the revolt of Vitalian (514–516) before the Trishagion riot (512).³⁷ The details of events are also rather inaccurate in places, or vague,³⁸ and there is even confusion when primary evidence is used, as Evagrius experiences difficulties in integrating this raw material into his narrative. For example, the letter to Alcison from the Palestinian monks attributing Flavian's deposition to Philoxenus does not support his own statement that bishops were only deposed by Anastasius if they acted contrary to the doctrinal beliefs of their sees.³⁹

Theodore Lector. Theodore Lector, ■ reader in St. Sophia, produced two works on ecclesiastical history.⁴⁰ The first was a compendium of church history from Constantine to Constantius II which was probably intended to serve as an introduction to a second work in two books, covering the period from Theodosius the Younger to Justin and Justinian. Unfortunately, only fragments remain of each, although much can be recovered from, for example, Theophanes who uses Theodore extensively. While Theodore Lector is a valuable source for Anastasius, as a near contemporary and one who worked in a position where he had access to official ecclesiastic documents, it is clear that he allowed his strong Chalcedonian belief to colour his account of the monophysite Anastasius. This bias is particularly prevalent in his accounts of the deposition of the patriarchs of Constantinople, the deposition of Flavian and consecration of Severus at Antioch, and the negotiations with Rome resulting from Vitalian's actions.⁴¹

n.114) and the deposition of Flavian (III.30 cf. 497ff.). On Evagrius' writing of history and his portrayal of Anastasius, Whitby (1998) 321ff, esp. 336ff.

³⁶ The Persian wars, III.37; the *chrysargyron*, III.39.

³⁷ The revolt of Vitalian, III.43; the riot III.44.

³⁸ Key incidents are only treated briefly: for example, the Isaurian revolt, III.35; the Arab plundering III.36; and the Persian wars III.37.

³⁹ Allen (1981) 149.

⁴⁰ Text edited by Hansen (1971); for further details, see the *ODB* III.2042 and Smith (1880) III.1047f. His dates are unknown, but as his history ended in 527, it is assumed he was writing during Justinian's reign.

⁴¹ For example: on Euphemius, 453–455; on Macedonius, esp. 461, 470ff, 483ff, 490–492; on Flavian and Severus, 498; on negotiations with Hormisdas, 511.

Greek Sources: Hagiographic Texts

Cyril of Scythopolis. Cyril of Scythopolis' *Life of St. Sabas* provides an invaluable account of the doctrinal affairs of the Church of Jerusalem, finally leading to the deposition of Elias in 516 and the installation of John.⁴² Ultimately, Anastasius is depicted unfavourably, as he was responsible for the ousting of Elias, but in the three recorded interviews between saint and emperor, he is presented as being moderate and reasonable in his views; indeed, he even supplies Sabas with funds.⁴³ Cyril, who lived just after the reign of Anastasius (c.525–c.559), knew Sabas personally, and his historical accuracy is generally recognised.⁴⁴

Daniel the Stylite. There is a brief paragraph in the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* (409–493) on Anastasius' reign, in which the emperor is complimented on his good legislation and impartial government of the state.⁴⁵ The biographer, younger than Daniel, was possibly composing during Anastasius' reign.⁴⁶

John Moschus. John Moschus, a monk (d.619), produced a compilation of monks' lives and moral tales known as the *Pratum Spiritale*.⁴⁷ He includes the apocryphal story about the deleted years of Anastasius' life.⁴⁸

Greek Sources: Histories and Quasi-Historical Works

Procopius of Caesarea. In the first two books of the *Wars*, Procopius provides ■ rather patchy account of the Anastasian war against the Persians, concentrating almost exclusively on the sieges of Amida.⁴⁹ In the *Wars*, and particularly in the *de Aedificiis*, the achievements of Anastasius are deliberately underrated in highlighting those of Justinian.⁵⁰

John the Lydian. A contemporary of Procopius, the civil servant, John the Lydian, wrote about Anastasius in his treatise on Roman

⁴² Text edited by Schwartz (1939) 85–200 and translated into French by Festugière (1962).

⁴³ Deposition of Elias, LVI; interviews, LI, LII and LIV.

⁴⁴ Cf. *ODB* I.573.

⁴⁵ Text, chapter 91, translated by Dawes and Baynes (1948).

⁴⁶ For discussion on the dating (end of the fifth century, or c.600) see the *ODB* I.585 and Dawes and Baynes (1948) 2.

⁴⁷ The best edition remains that in *PL* 87.3, cols.2847–3116.

⁴⁸ John Moschus, chapter 38, cf. *Mal.* 408–409 and the *Chron. Pasch.* 518. On John Moschus, see Smith (1880) II.1116f.

⁴⁹ Edited by Haury (1963–1964) and translated Dewing (1914).

⁵⁰ See the comments by Greatrex (1998) 74, with n.6 on Procopius' objectives, and 120.

magistrates.⁵¹ John, an antiquarian, values Anastasius' appreciation of culture and praises the emperor for various acts of generosity. Deeds which earn John's disapproval are attributed to the real villains, Marinus the Syrian (for administration) and Areobindus, Patricius and Hypatius (for the Persian war).⁵²

Codex Iustinianus. The *Codex Iustinianus* is invaluable for its preservation of Anastasius' legislation.⁵³

Oracle of Baalbek. The *Oracle of Baalbek* is another contemporary source for Anastasius, but is not particularly useful.⁵⁴ In 502–503, a Christian editor, Chalcedonian in persuasion, expanded the late fourth-century work, the *Theodosian Sibyl*, but he is inaccurate in his description of Anastasius and over the length of his reign.⁵⁵ Moreover, he does not conceal his opposition to either Anastasius' religious views or his administration of the state, thus devaluing the historicity of the text: for example "He will ruin many from among the people either lawfully or unlawfully and will depose those who observe godliness".⁵⁶

Constantine Porphyrogenitus. There is a detailed record of the process of Anastasius' accession to the imperial throne in the *de Ceremoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.⁵⁷

Latin Sources: the Chronicles

Marcellinus Comes. The Illyrian, Marcellinus *Comes*, produced an annalistic chronicle continuing that of Jerome from 379 to 518 and then on to 534.⁵⁸ Although he lived in Constantinople working as a

⁵¹ *de Magistratibus Populi Romani*, translated and edited by Carney (1971) and Bandy (1983).

⁵² Anastasius is praised III.47; criticism of Marinus III.49 and the three generals III.53. See Maas (1992) 108–9 showing that John compressed the events of Anastasius' reign to illustrate his argument of how portents could foretell future events.

⁵³ Text edited by Krueger (1954) vol.II, and translated into English by Scott (1932). There is a selection of laws relating to episcopal matters in Coleman-Norton (1966) 940ff.

⁵⁴ Text edited by Alexander (1967).

⁵⁵ On the editor of the *Oracle of Baalbek*, see Alexander (1967) 136–140; on the dating of the text, 41f. The description of Anastasius is given at lines 165ff, cf. Mal. 392, and on the length of his reign, see Alexander (1967) 83–84.

⁵⁶ πολλοὺς δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπολέσει δικαίως ἀδίκως καὶ καθελεί τοὺς τηροῦντας θεοσεβείαν. *Oracle of Baalbek* 168–170 (tr. Alexander). On the historical value of the text, see Alexander (1967) 75ff, esp. 95–97.

⁵⁷ *de Ceremoniis* I.92, edited by Reiske (1829).

⁵⁸ Text and translation, see Croke (1995). Marcellinus also wrote *De Temporum Qualitatibus et Positionibus Locorum*, from which, Croke (1984) 77ff conjectures, comes the passage on the building of Dara. See further, *PLRE* II.710–711, Marcellinus 10, and see Croke (1995) xix–xxvii.

cancellarius of Justinian, he offers detailed and sometimes eye-witness accounts of the barbarian invasions of the Balkans in 499, 502 and 517, and the earthquake of 518. For incidents in Constantinople (such as the factional riots after the Brytae festival⁵⁹ and the riots in 512) he provides a comprehensive and often our only account. It is possible that he made use of oral sources, particularly for the Persian war when his information comes from the *magister officiorum*, Celer, or from official despatches.⁶⁰ As for impartiality, the firm adherence of the Illyrians to orthodoxy and their opposition to the monophysite emperor are reflected in the chronicler's antipathy towards Anastasius and his religious policy.⁶¹ In the section on Vitalian, Anastasius is again portrayed unfavourably, for example: "Next, misled and deluded by the pretences and lies of Anastasius through his intermediary Theodorus, [Vitalian] departed on the eighth day after reaching the city".⁶²

Victor of Tunnuna. There is a section on Anastasius in the chronicle of Victor of Tunnuna, a North African bishop.⁶³ Strongly orthodox himself, his chronicle is weighted towards doctrinal affairs to the detriment of the emperor's character. He also perpetuates some of the more sensational stories about Anastasius.⁶⁴

Latin Sources for Ecclesiastical Policy

The *Liber Pontificalis*. The series of papal biographies contained in the *Liber Pontificalis* is invaluable for the study of the doctrinal rift between Constantinople and Rome which continued and widened through the reign of Anastasius.⁶⁵ The *Lives* of Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius II, Symmachus and Hormisdas charter the relationships of these popes with Anastasius, giving details of correspondence and embassies between the two sides.

The *Collectio Avellana*. An even fuller source for relations between the Churches of the east and west is that of the *Collectio Avellana*.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ Marc. C. 501; Croke (1995) 111.

⁶⁰ Marc. C. 502–4.

⁶¹ Marc. C. 494.

⁶² *porro Anastasii simulationibus atque periuriis per Theodorum internuntium inlectus atque inlusus octavo die quam urbem accesserat remeavit*. Marc. C. 514 (tr. Croke).

⁶³ Text in *PL* 68, cols.941–962, and Mommsen (1894).

⁶⁴ Vict. Tun. 518 on Anastasius' death.

⁶⁵ Text edited by Duchesne (1955) vol.I. For discussion on the exact nature of the *Liber Pontificalis*, see Noble (1985).

⁶⁶ There are several editions; see esp. Thiel (1868) and Gunther (1895–1898). The lives, letters and decrees of the popes of Anastasius' reign had already been published by

This is a collection of letters including, of primary importance, correspondence between emperor and pope: for example, the conciliatory letter of Anastasius II to the emperor,⁶⁷ and the rather less conciliatory *Apologeticus Symmachi episcopi Romani adversus Anastasium imperatorem*.⁶⁸ Also of especial interest are the letters of Hormisdas, not only to the emperor⁶⁹ but also to his own envoys bound for Constantinople,⁷⁰ and Anastasius' epistle seeking the support of the senate.⁷¹ Such primary evidence vividly illustrates the shifting doctrinal positions of the late fifth and early sixth centuries.

Paul the Deacon and Landolfus Sagax. Details concerning the Laurentian schism and the 516 embassy despatched by Hormisdas are recorded in the *Historia Romana* (book XVI) of the eighth-century Paul the Deacon.⁷² Landolfus Sagax, continuing the work of Eutropius and Paul, gives a fuller account of Anastasius' reign. He records not only the affairs of the Church (the origins of the Laurentian schism, the Trishagion riots, and the ecclesiastical consequences of Vitalian's revolt), but also the incursions of the Persians, Bulgars and Huns. He is also not averse to including the more apocryphal stories circulating about Anastasius.⁷³

Liberatus. More limited in scope for the Anastasian period is the *Breviarium Causae Nestorianorum et Eutylianorum* of Liberatus, a Carthaginian deacon.⁷⁴ He dealt solely with the affairs of the eastern Church such as the deposition of Macedonius and Severus' adoption and teaching of monophysitism.⁷⁵

Mansi, vol. VIII (1762) and similar information was included in the *Ecclesiastical Annals* of Caesar Baronius, vol. VI (1596). Both include lengthy quotations of letters of the emperor and popes. More recently, the *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. Jaffé (1885–1888) provides excerpts from the registers of popes, details of their actions and extracts from their letters. A selection of Anastasius' letters (in English translation) on ecclesiastical unity is included in Coleman-Norton's *Roman state and Christian Church: a collection of legal documents to AD 535* (1966) esp. 955ff.

⁶⁷ Mansi (1762) VIII.188, Jaffé (1885–1888) no. 744, Thiel (1868) 615f.

⁶⁸ Mansi (1762) VIII.213ff, Thiel (1868) 700ff.

⁶⁹ Mansi (1762) VIII.388, Jaffé (1885–1888) no. 773, Thiel (1868) 747, Gunther (1895–1898) no. 110.

⁷⁰ Mansi (1762) VIII.386, Jaffé (1885–1888) no. 774, Thiel (1868) 748, Gunther (1895–1898) no. 116.

⁷¹ Thiel (1868) 765, Gunther (1895–1898) no. 113.

⁷² Text edited by Droysen (1879). For discussion, see the chapter in Goffart (1988) esp. pp. 357–70.

⁷³ Text is also edited by Droysen (1879). For the deaths of Macedonius and Anastasius, book XVII, pp. 366–367.

⁷⁴ Text (chapter XIX) in PL 68, cols. 969–1052.

⁷⁵ Further details in Smith (1880) II.777.

Latin Sources for Anastasius' Western policy.

Information concerning Anastasius' western policy can be found in the writings of those Latin authors who devoted themselves to recording the events of the reign of Theoderic.

Anonymus Valesianus. The author of the passages known as the *Excerpta Valesiana*, who compiled his material at the end of Theoderic's reign (c.526), records the establishment of peace between Theoderic and Anastasius secured through Festus, and the return of the *ornamenta palatii* to Rome.⁷⁶ His account has fuelled lengthy discussions on the relative status of Italy at the time.

Cassiodorus. Valuable material for the study of Byzantine-Roman relations is provided by the senator, Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus (c.485–c.580). As *magister officiorum* at the court of Theoderic the Great, he was in the position to produce a well-informed history of contemporary events: his chronicle is an excellent source for Theoderic's activities in Italy during Anastasius' reign, and for the king's aspirations for the expansion of Italy.⁷⁷ However, Cassiodorus' most significant contribution to source material was his *Variae*, a collection in twelve books of the edicts and letters of Theoderic (prepared by Cassiodorus himself).⁷⁸ The second book begins with a letter from Theoderic to Anastasius, dated 510, asking for confirmation of the appointment of the consul Felix. Again, this has provoked discussion about the extent of Theoderic's independence from Constantinople.

Jordanes. The historian Jordanes, a contemporary of Cassiodorus, produced the *Romana*, of which only the section on Roman history from Romulus to 550/551 remains extant, and the *Getica*.⁷⁹ These two texts offer useful information on the relationship between Constantinople and Ravenna: Theoderic's status in Italy, his ousting of Byzantium's allies (the Gepids) from Sirmium, and Anastasius' despatch of a fleet against the Italian coast.⁸⁰ The *Romana* also includes information about Anastasius' wars against the Isaurians, Bulgars, and Vitalian; Jordanes concludes that the emperor's impiety was the reason

⁷⁶ Text edited by Moreau and Velkov (1968), and see their introduction for a study on the author.

⁷⁷ The *Chronicon* is most easily available in PL 69, cols. 1213–1248.

⁷⁸ The *Variae* edited by Mommsen (1894) and translated into English by Hodgkin (1886) and Barnish (1992).

⁷⁹ Both edited by Mommsen (1882). See further, the ODB II.1072 and Goffart (1988) chapter 2.

⁸⁰ Rom. 349, Get. 300–1, Rom. 356.

for the proliferation of enemies facing him.⁸¹

Ennodius. Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, left contemporary accounts of the situation in Italy during the Anastasian period.⁸² He led some of the embassies from Hormisdas to Anastasius but, being personally involved in the doctrinal rift, his writings are heavily biased. Neither the *Panegyricus Theoderico regi dictus* (favouring the king) nor the *Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumerunt* (which passionately defended the Synodus Palmaris of 501), presents a balanced view of the political or religious situation in Italy.⁸³

Gregory of Tours. For Anastasius' policy towards Gaul, the *Historiae Francorum* of Gregory, bishop of Tours, is a key, if controversial, source.⁸⁴ Gregory became bishop of Tours in 573 and produced his history of the Franks and his *Miracula* during the next two decades, before his death in the 590s. The passage describing the bestowal of the consular codicils on Clovis has led to a debate on the nature of the consulship and the reason for Anastasius' gesture.⁸⁵

Syriac Sources: the Chronicles

Joshua Stylites. For a contemporary account of the Persian wars, the chronicle of Joshua Stylites is probably the most reliable source.⁸⁶ The chronicle is preserved only in the work of Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre and the identity of the original author is unknown. Opinion at present favours Joshua, the priest at the monastery of Zugnin near Amida, as the scribe, and a citizen of Edessa as the author.⁸⁷ It has been argued that the author had a two-fold motive in writing: religious (to record the hardships caused by the war and natural disasters as 'divine punishments'), and political (to clear Anastasius from all blame for the war). From the nature of the information in the chronicle, it is clear that the author was personally involved with the war effort in Edessa, and, as he

claims, had met ambassadors on both sides. He leaves valuable eyewitness accounts of the events of the Persian war, with detailed information about the local situation such as plague, famine and natural disasters, and he notes Anastasius' help in times of need.⁸⁸ Information regarding Anastasius' abolition of the *chrysargyron* is also given, with the description of the joyful reaction to the news at Edessa.⁸⁹

James of Edessa. The seventh-century James (Jacob) of Edessa, monophysite monk and patriarch, composed a chronicle as a continuation of Eusebius' canon (AD 326) to 692.⁹⁰ The now damaged text includes a section on Anastasius, mainly devoted to notices on natural phenomena, appointments and dismissals of bishops and patriarchs, the capture of Amida and the revolt of Vitalian. James also edited the *Hymns* of Severus and of John of Beith Aphthonia (Severus' biographer) which are very relevant for Anastasius' reign: they include celebrations of the emperor's victories over Vitalian, the Huns, the Persians, and polemics against games and entertainment.⁹¹

Anonymous chronicles. There is a series of Syriac anonymous chronicles which contain brief annalistic entries on eastern affairs during Anastasius' reign, especially church news and reports on the Persian war. The earliest of these is the *Chronicon Edessenicum*, compiled about 540.⁹² It includes notices about Euphemius and Macedonius, the fortunes of Edessa during the Persian war and the tale of Anastasius opening the coffin of the martyr Euphemia to remove and burn the Book of the Chalcedonian Council. The author obviously had access to the archives of Edessa and documents from Antioch.⁹³

The *Chronicon miscellaneum ad AD 724 pertinens* and the *Chronicon anonymum ad AD 819 pertinens* offer very short entries for the reign of Anastasius, the former concerning Severus, and the latter on Kavadh's assaults on Amida and Edessa.⁹⁴ The *Chronicon ad AD 846 pertinens*, compiled by a monophysite monk, gives an assortment of information ranging from lists of patricians and natural phenomena to a more lengthy account of the rise of Philoxenus and Severus and the fall of

⁸¹ *Rom.* 359.

⁸² Ennodius, *Opera*, edited by Vogel (1885).

⁸³ Smith (1880) II.19–20.

⁸⁴ Text edited by Krusch (1937–1951), and translated into English, Dalton (1927). Generally on Gregory, see Goffart (1988) chapter 3.

⁸⁵ *Greg.* II.38.

⁸⁶ For an English translation, Wright (1882), and Watt and Trombley (1998); for translation and commentary in German, Luther (1997).

⁸⁷ For various discussions on Joshua and the author, see Wright (1884) 77–8, Duval (1900) 188ff, Torrey (1950–1) 439ff, and esp. Palmer (1990b) passim, Brock (1992) 10ff. For discussion on the historiographical nature of the chronicle and the suggestion that Joshua was familiar with the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, see Watt (1999).

⁸⁸ The plague, 26; earthquakes, 34; the locusts, 38; famine, 39ff; and the emperor's help, 42.

⁸⁹ *Josh.* 31.

⁹⁰ English translation by Brooks (1899).

⁹¹ The *Hymns* edited by Brooks (1911).

⁹² Latin translation by Guidi (1903).

⁹³ Wright (1884) 101ff; Duval (1900) 189–90; Brock (1992) 3f.

⁹⁴ Latin translation of the *Chronicon ad 724* by Chabot (1903) and *Chronicon ad 819* by Chabot (1952). For brief information on the latter, see Brock (1992) 13.

Flavian.⁹⁵ Lastly, the *Chronicon anonymum ad AD 1234 pertinens*, composed by a thirteenth-century monk, provides a long description of the siege and capture of Amida and a notice on the foundation of Dara.⁹⁶

Michael the Syrian. Michael the Syrian was a Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (1166–69) and his chronicle (from the Creation to his own day) is favourable to the monophysite Anastasius.⁹⁷ He provides us with detailed accounts of the Persian war, the foundation of Dara, the Trishagion riots, the deposition of Macedonius and the deeds of Philoxenus, Severus and Simeon the Disputer.⁹⁸

Elias of Nisibis. The eastern Syriac chronicle of Elias, the metropolitan bishop of Nisibis (1008–48), is of some use for Persian history before and during the Anastasian war, though it adds nothing new.⁹⁹

Gregory Abul Faraj (Bar Hebraeus). The *Universal Chronicle* of Gregory Abul Faraj (Bar Hebraeus), who lived in the thirteenth century, contains, in an appendix, a legend about the building of Dara.¹⁰⁰

Syriac Sources: Ecclesiastical Works

Ps-Zachariah. An ecclesiastical history was written by Ps-Zachariah rhetor, bishop of Mytilene.¹⁰¹ It is not clear whether he may be identified with the monophysite Zachariah Scholasticus, author of the *Vita Severi*. As bishop of Mytilene, he attended the Chalcedonian synod at Constantinople in 536, indicating that at some point he had converted from his earlier monophysite beliefs. However, it is plausible that the monophysite Zachariah would have made an expedient conversion under the new orthodox government.¹⁰²

⁹⁵ Latin translation of the *Chronicon ad 846* by Chabot (1903). Again, brief comments can be found in Brock (1992) 14.

⁹⁶ Latin translation of the *Chronicon ad 1234* by Chabot (1952). See Brock (1992) 17–18 on the identity of the author.

⁹⁷ French translation by Chabot (1899–1910). For Anastasius, see book IX, chapters 7–11. A detailed study on Michael by Tisserant is available in the *DTC* (1927–30) vol.X, col.1711ff, and see Brock (1992) 16 for a table of the sources which Michael claimed to have used.

⁹⁸ Persian wars, IX.7; Dara, IX.8; riots, IX.7; Philoxenus and Severus, IX.10; Macedonius, IX.9, and Simeon, IX.9.

⁹⁹ Latin translation by Brooks (1910). For comments, see Brock (1992) 26–27.

¹⁰⁰ English translation by Budge (1932). See Wright (1884) 265ff.

¹⁰¹ Latin translation by Brooks (1919–1924). For a general study, see *PLRE* II.1194–1195, Zachariah 4, and Allen (1980) 471–474.

¹⁰² For discussion on the identity of the various Zachariahs, see Brock (1992) 4f; Kugener

All that is left of the *Ecclesiastical History*, originally written in Greek, is a Syriac epitome, compiled by a monk of Amida, completed in 569. Only books III–IV (451–491) were actually written by Zachariah; VII–XII were compiled in 569. The later author also used other primary sources, such as Eustathius for the siege of Amida.¹⁰³

The history treats very favourably the monophysite Severus, Marinus the Syrian, and the emperor himself, and was dedicated to Eupraxius, a *cubicularius* at the court of Anastasius and a prominent supporter of Severus.¹⁰⁴ The work includes a very detailed account of the relations between the emperor and Macedonius leading up to the deposition of the patriarch,¹⁰⁵ and of the rebellion of Vitalian where he is portrayed as a barbarian who held imperial power in contempt.¹⁰⁶ It is clear that the same strong monophysite support evident in the *Vita Severi* is also present here.

Lives and Letters of Severus. Two *Vitae Severi* in honour of the great monophysite figure survive in Syriac. Zachariah, as a fellow student of Severus in Alexandria during the 480s, was well placed to write a biography and includes much information on their student days. He was working in Constantinople when Severus arrived in 508 with his deputation of monks and wrote up to the time of Severus' patriarchate, therefore providing a contemporary, if biased, account. A second composition glorifying the life of Severus was written by John, the abbot of the monastery of Beith-Aphthonia.¹⁰⁷ He died in 536, and must have been contemporary with Severus and Anastasius.

The collection of Severus' letters is also a crucial source for Severus himself and the doctrinal controversy in general.¹⁰⁸ The epistles contain Severus' own views on the *Henoticon* and Anastasius' *typos*, plus information about various synods.¹⁰⁹

John of Ephesus. Of the ecclesiastical history of John, the monophysite bishop of Ephesus, the second part covering the reign of Anastasius is preserved in the chronicle of the eighth-century Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre.¹¹⁰ Born in 507, John would have been

(1900) 202ff, Honigmann (1952) 194ff, Bauer (1967) 210ff, and Allen (1980) who believe there is only one Zachariah; contra Frend (1972) 202–203 who believes the writer of the ecclesiastical history is not the author of the *Vita Severi*.

¹⁰³ See Greatrex (1994) 8.

¹⁰⁴ Zach. of Myt. III–prologue; on Marinus VII.9; on Severus VII.12.

¹⁰⁵ Zach. of Myt. VII.7–8.

¹⁰⁶ Zach. of Myt. on the Isaurians VII.2; on Vitalian VII.13.

¹⁰⁷ Latin translations of both *Lives* by Kugener (1907).

¹⁰⁸ Translated by Brooks (1903–1904) and (1919–1920).

¹⁰⁹ Sel. Let. I:2; I:1; and I:20.

¹¹⁰ The second part of John of Ephesus' history is also preserved in the chronicle of Michael

growing up in the later years of Anastasius' reign and he made use of the contemporary Malalas, Joshua and Zachariah.¹¹¹ He concentrates on recording natural phenomena, the Persian war, the Trishagion riots, the exile of Macedonius and various church councils. The work is heavily biased in favour of monophysitism.

John's *Lives of Eastern Saints* is also a useful source.¹¹² In the *Life* of the Persian Mar Simeon is preserved a letter (sent at Simeon's request) from Anastasius to the Persian king requesting that the Christians in Persia should not be persecuted.¹¹³

Arabic Sources

al-Tabari. One of the most important Arab historians is the ninth-century al-Tabari who wrote an extensive world history. Although he does not directly cover Anastasius' Persian war, his discussion of the life and deeds of Kavadh (and Persian-Arab relations) provides useful background information.¹¹⁴

Agapius of Menbidj. The tenth-century Christian Arab historian, Agapius of Menbidj (Hierapolis), also produced a universal history, entitled the *Book of Time*.¹¹⁵ Adding nothing new, he offers the usual brief annual entries on the appointments and banishments of bishops, the fortification of Dara, the Trishagion riot and natural phenomena.

Chronicle of Seert. The second part of the eleventh-century anonymous *Chronicle of Seert*, also known as the *Nestorian History*, deals with the period 484–650 and contains a section on Anastasius.¹¹⁶ It includes Anastasius' conversion to monophysitism and the subsequent riots, the early life of Severus and the background to the Persian war; as usual, the centre-piece is the siege of Amida.

the Syrian, and the chronicles to the years 846 and 1234. See Nau (1897) for the text of John's history, and Wright (1884) 102ff and Brock (1992) 5f for comments. English translations can be found in Witakowski, *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle, part III* (1996) and Harrak, *The Chronicle of Zuqnān, parts III and IV* (1999). For the identity of the author and discussion about the text, see the introductions in Witakowski and Harrak, with Wright (1884) 196ff and Brock (1992) 10ff.

¹¹¹ For a full study of John's sources, see Witakowski (1991) 252ff.

¹¹² English translation by Brooks (1923–6).

¹¹³ *PO* 17 (1923), no. X, p.137ff.

¹¹⁴ French translation by Zotenberg (1867–1874). See generally, the *ODB* III.2003.

¹¹⁵ French translation by Vasiliev (1910–1912). Biographical information can be found in the *ODB* I.35.

¹¹⁶ French translation by Scher (1911).

Ethiopic Sources

Athanasius. The *Conflict of Severus* by Athanasius is preserved only in Ethiopic.¹¹⁷ The author was probably a patriarch of Antioch, living about a century after Severus. Although further removed in time than the other biographers, Zachariah and John, Athanasius claims accuracy and authenticity as his grandfather and father both knew Severus. The *Life* traces the conflicts faced by Severus, such as the opposition of Julianus of Halicarnassus and Macedonius.

John of Nikiu. Another work of which only the Ethiopic version is extant is the seventh-century chronicle of John, monophysite bishop of Nikiu.¹¹⁸ John begins his chapter on Anastasius with a tale of how the emperor was exiled by Zeno, and continues with the riots in Constantinople and Antioch. He traces the religious strife in some depth, before ending with a detailed description of Vitalian's revolt and defeat.

Coptic Sources

Severus, Bishop of Ashmunain. Short biographies of the patriarchs of Anastasius' reign can be found in *The History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, composed by Severus, bishop of El-Eschmounein in High Egypt.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ English translation by Goodspeed and Crum (1908).

¹¹⁸ English translation by Charles (1916), chapter LXXXIX. See the *ODB* II.1066 for further information about John and the transmission of the chronicle.

¹¹⁹ English translation with introduction by Evetts (1907).

Appendix B

Dating the Panegyrics

The accurate dating of the panegyrics of Priscian and Procopius is important since these works are themselves often used to assist with the dating of key measures and events in the reign of Anastasius. Opinion is divided between an early date of circa 502/503 and a later one of 512–515.

Priscian

In considering the date of Priscian's panegyric, there are a number of specific references to take into account, as well as the general context.

Much of the argument in support of a date of 513 rests on lines 298–300:

Hypatii vestri referam fortissima facta
qui Scythicas gentes ripis depellit ab Histri,
quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum?

Shall I mention the most intrepid deeds of your Hypatius
who is driving the Scythian tribes from the banks of the Hister?
The Parthian has seen that he is strong and knows that he is to be
feared.¹

It is suggested that lines 298–299 refer to the military action conducted by Hypatius, the emperor's nephew, against the Scythians, identified here as the troops of Vitalian, and that line 300 alludes to the Persian war. Chauvot and Coyne argue that the panegyric was written in the autumn of 513 for the celebration in the Great Church of Hypatius' initial successes against Vitalian, and suggest that a panegyric, always an effective source of imperial propaganda, would be most welcome in 513 when Anastasius' position was being threatened by both the insurrection of Vitalian and the religious riots.² However, the arguments in support of these lines as a reference to Vitalian's revolt are not secure.

Chauvot points out that the verbs used of the Parthian (*vidit* and *sensit*) are perfect tense denoting that the war took place in the past, while the verb used for the Scythians (*depellit*) is present tense,

¹ In this appendix all translations of Priscian's panegyric are taken from Coyne (1991).

² For general arguments in favour of a date of 513, see Chauvot (1977) and (1986) 98–107, including a survey of previous literature on the problem, and Coyne (1991) 7–16.

indicating that the war was ongoing at the present time. However, this argument is not watertight, as the present tense is used on other occasions for vividness in past situations, especially, for example, concerning the Isaurian war:

deicit hos summi genitoris dextera flagrans

For the fiery hand of the supreme Father strikes those men [the
Isaurians] (line 101)

and

*pro qua cum ventis sociantur proelia nimbis,
ignibus et rapidis armantur fulgura bello
percutiuntque sono concussa tonitrua montes.*

In support of this piety winds and storm clouds are allied to
[Anastasius'] battles;
the lightning flashes are armed for war with devouring fire
and the thunder reverberates and smites the mountains with its crash.³
(lines 104–106)

Cameron believes that it is improbable that Priscian would reverse the chronology of events in consecutive lines, placing Vitalian's revolt before mention of the Parthian.⁴ He cites the evidence of John of Antioch, that the Hypatius involved in the initial stages of the Vitalian revolt, as referred to here, was not the emperor's nephew Hypatius, who had fought in the Persian war.⁵ Cameron speculates that Hypatius (the emperor's nephew) was involved in one of the earlier Bulgar invasions (493, 499 or 502), thus the allusion to the Scythians. Marcellinus *Comes*, whose knowledge of the various barbarian tribes in the Balkans was arguably at least as accurate as that of his contemporaries since he came from Illyricum, refers to these Bulgars as Scythians.⁶

Coyne argues that line 265:

utraqe Roma tibi nam spero pareat uni

Both Romes, I hope, may now obey you alone

³ Cf. Chauvot (1977) 545, and on Hypatius, see Chauvot (1986) 100–107.

⁴ Cameron (1974) proposes an early dating of 503. He argues (p.313) against Endlicher and Stein who date the poem to 512, basing their argument on the identification of the Scythians as Vitalian's rebels (lines 298–300), even though 512 is far too early for this insurrection. Marcellinus *Comes* dates the outbreak of the revolt to 514 (cf. ch. 5, p.167) which also creates problems for the 513 dating of Chauvot and Coyne. Cameron's date, however, while much closer to the correct dating, is probably still about six months too late, as argued below.

⁵ John of Ant. fr.214e; see Cameron (1974) 313–315 and above, ch. 5 p.168.

⁶ Marc. C. 493; for a discussion on the confusion surrounding the identity of barbarian tribes, ch. 4, p.104.

is a reference to the possibility of support from Theoderic and Hormisdas for Vitalian's rebellion and an allusion to the ever widening doctrinal schism between emperor and pope. The hope that Old Rome might be sympathetic to Constantinople would also be very relevant in 502 during the Laurentian schism, a time when emperor and pope (on this occasion, Symmachus) were at loggerheads. The emphasis placed on Anastasius' divine right to rule and the auspicious age over which he presides is not necessarily used specifically to retain the loyalty of any potential deserters (such as Chalcedonians or those with western ties) as argued by Coyne, but both themes were common in panegyrics.⁷

Coyne sees the last lines of the panegyric:

barbariaeque ferae capiant iuga vera subactae,
votaque firmentur populi Sanctique Senatus.

may the savage barbarians be conquered and truly submit to the yoke
and may the prayers of the people and holy senate be confirmed.

as a direct reference to Vitalian's revolt. After all, the senate had branded Vitalian, always portrayed as a barbarian, a public enemy, while the "prayers" referred to the service held to commemorate Hypatius' success. Coyne goes further than Chauvot in seeing the panegyric as a deliberate part of the propaganda campaign against Vitalian. However, the "savage barbarians" may equally be the Persians who in 502 were preparing to invade the eastern provinces of the empire.⁸

Allusions to the Persian war in the panegyric, which would necessarily date the poem post 506, are also problematic. Apart from this last example, there are only two possible references. Firstly in lines 254–260:

haec propter celsi dominator maximus axis
infestos vestris avertit ab arcibus hostes,
quos furor iniustus violato foedere movit,
Euphratis vasti prope maxima flumina raptim

⁷ Coyne (1991) 7–16 on the divine right of imperial rule; esp. p.10 on how the difficult years of 511–515 would make an appropriate time for a reminder of Anastasius' divine sanction. She remarks (p.16) that one way to guard against disloyalty from westerners would be to commission a panegyric from a poet with western ties (she argues elsewhere (pp.5ff) that Priscian came from Caesarea in Mauretania). However, the divine right to rule is a familiar theme in panegyrics in late antiquity; Corippus emphasises Justin II's God-given right to rule in his panegyric especially, for example, in Book 1.28–65 when the Mother of God symbolically invests Justin with the imperial insignia.

⁸ Priscian may also have meant the final lines of his panegyric to be nothing more than a general hope and prayer for the good fortune of the emperor. Following the rules of Menander for writing imperial encomia (II.377), the epilogue was reserved for such remarks concerning the prosperity of the empire.

ex improviso latronum more ruentes.
sed Deus in propiam cladem converterat illos,
consiliisque tuis iustissima damna tulerunt.

For these reasons the almighty Lord of the lofty heavens
turned aside from your strongholds dangerous enemies
who were roused unjustly by fury since it was they who
violated their treaty, and who suddenly and violently erupted like
bandits near the almighty streams of the vast Euphrates.
But God had moved them to their own destruction and because
of your plans they suffered the losses they deserved.

This allusion, which does not refer to the Persians by name, would also be an appropriate description of the Roman victory over the Arabs in 502.⁹ The second citation falls in line 300 (discussed above): "The Parthian has seen that he is strong and knows that he is to be feared". Priscian, however, does not specifically mention military activity and this may be a reference only to Anastasius' hardline stance in the years prior to the Persian incursion when he refused to agree to requests from the Persian king for financial subsidies.¹⁰ Coyne suggests that little mention is made of the Persian war because it did not directly challenge Anastasius' hold on the throne, and also because Vitalian and his father had both served in the imperial army. However, the Persian invasion into Mesopotamia was a major military threat, and given that Anastasius managed to contain the attack, conclude a peace treaty, and undertake significant repairs to eastern defences, it would be surprising if Priscian did not allude to the war, giving a favourable spin to Anastasius' leadership. It is perhaps more plausible that Priscian did not refer to the invasion because he was writing in the summer of 502, just before the Persians crossed the border into the east Roman provinces.

As for the general context, the emphasis on the Isaurian war and the *chrysargyron* points to an early date. The climax of the poem centres on two triumphant scenes in the hippodrome: the burning of the *chrysargyron* tax records (II.162–171) and the display of the captured Isaurian leaders (II.171–179). Such a focus seems more appropriate if these events were fairly recent history, rather than fifteen years in the past.¹¹ Cameron also believes that references to faction riots and

⁹ Cf. Helm (1954) col.2343 and Ficarra (1978) 1.364; contra Chauvot (1986) 136–138.

¹⁰ Cf. ch. 3 p.52.

¹¹ Cameron (1974), contra Chauvot (1977) 540 who argues that a date of 503 would still mean that there was a gap of five years between the ending of the Isaurian war and the abolition of the *chrysargyron* thus invalidating the point that the panegyric was written as a direct response to these achievements. He suggests that such emphasis was placed on the Isaurian war in 513 to recall the victory at a time when the empire was again in danger.

earthquakes, for example, are more appropriate in the context of 502/503.¹² Allusions to the banning of games and the wild beast shows are again more relevant to this period when Anastasius had banned wild beast shows in 499 and pantomimes in 502.¹³ Lines 194–195:

Curia perversis nam cessat moribus omnis,
Nec licet iniustis solito contemnere leges:

For every curia refrains from evil practices
and the unjust are not allowed to scorn the laws as was their custom

have been taken to refer to the *vindices* which Chauvot argues were introduced by Marinus during his prefecture of 506/507, thus providing another terminus ante quem for the poem.¹⁴ Firstly, however, there is no evidence that these lines are in fact a specific allusion to the introduction of the *vindices* (since they are not named). Secondly, the evidence for the date of their introduction is uncertain. Cyril of Scythopolis claimed they were established in Palestine before 511/512 therefore pre-dating Marinus' praetorian prefecture from 512 to 515. But Marinus, obviously an influential figure at court, could have introduced *vindices* just after the tax reforms of 498 when appointed *tractator* after John the Paphlagonian.¹⁵

Arguments from silence can never be accepted as certain evidence of dating. However, given that Priscian praises Anastasius' building projects (lines 180–192), the omission of important and successful aspects of Anastasius' defensive building programme is surprising. If Priscian was indeed composing this panegyric as part of the imperial propaganda machine during the insurrection of Vitalian, he surely would have included key sites, such as the Long wall and the fortification of Dara, witnesses of imperial defence measures taken against other hostile forces.¹⁶ Indeed throughout the panegyric, Priscian gives

¹² Faction rioting, unconnected to the doctrinal schism, occurred mainly in the first half of Anastasius' reign: cf. ch. 6, pp.223–229, esp. n.224. See further Cameron (1974) 315–316 who also notes that there was a series of earthquakes between 494 and 503, followed by a long gap before the earthquake on Rhodes in 515.

¹³ *ipse vetas ludos, animarum damna, nefandos / atque voluptates prohibes a sanguine sumi, / corporis et causa pascendi perdere vitam, / humanos arcens lacerari dentibus artus, / dentibus, armatur rabies quibus atra ferarum* (You also forbid the evil games, that damnation of souls. / You prevent bloodshed from being a source of pleasure, / You prevent men from losing their lives to feed their bodies / and human limbs from being torn apart by the teeth / which arm the deadly fury of wild beasts.) ll.223–227; cf. ch. 6, p.228.

¹⁴ Cf. Chauvot (1986) 99.

¹⁵ Cf. ch. 6, p.207.

¹⁶ While there is uncertainty over the date of the building of the wall (cf. ch. 4 pp.107–108, and below, p.278), it is evident that, if Priscian was writing this encomium in 513, the omission of the wall would certainly be problematic given that all the

the impression that since the Isaurian revolt had been dealt with, the empire was now at peace: *nunc hominum generi laetissima saecula currunt* (now there is passing ■ most prosperous age for the race of men, line 149).¹⁷

It therefore appears that the arguments for a dating of c.513 which rely on specific references in the text are not conclusive. The supposed citations of the revolt of Vitalian and the Persian war may in fact be allusions to the Bulgar invasions in the 490s and early 500s, and to the Arab incursion in early 502. At the same time, the general context of the poem, in particular the focus on the Isaurian war and the abolition of the *chrysargyron*, points to a date of composition in the early months of 502.

Procopius

There are similar problems with the dating of Procopius' panegyric. While we are told that the encomium was delivered at the setting up of the emperor's statue in Gaza,¹⁸ this information is of no help in determining the timing of the delivery. Again, a suitable date has to be conjectured from clues gleaned from within the text, extrapolating from both specific references and general context.

Like Priscian, Procopius highlights the defeat of the Isaurians (9) and the abolition of the *chrysargyron* (13). Of the references to events which can be dated accurately, the latest fall in the year 502: the Arab incursions (7) and the banning of pantomimes (16). Other achievements are of less certain dating. For example, the improvements to the harbour at Caesarea (19) cannot be securely dated, although there is some evidence to suggest that they were undertaken after damage caused by the 502 earthquake.¹⁹ Similarly, there is uncertainty over the aqueduct at Hierapolis (18), variously dated to 502 or 505/6.²⁰ The general

suggested dates for its construction (except the late date of 517 provided by the unreliable *Chronicon Paschale*) fell before 513 (497, c.503 and 512); cf. Croke (1982b) *passim*.

¹⁷ While it is important to be aware that Priscian was following conventions in the writing of panegyric (achievements in war followed by achievements in peace), the chronology and particular exempla used suggest that Priscian was referring to the relatively "prosperous" age of the years 498–502 when, after his Isaurian victory, Anastasius was able to turn his attention to the economy and domestic reform, before the outbreak of the Persian war. The later years of his reign, beset by deepening doctrinal schism and the threat of Vitalian, could hardly be described as *laetissima*.

¹⁸ On Procopius' delivery of the poem to the statue, see Kempen (1918) xii and Chauvot (1986) 97–98.

¹⁹ Cf. ch. 7, pp.232–233.

²⁰ Cf. ch. 7, p.232.

allusions to Anastasius' attention to justice and legislation on family matters (22) are rather too vague to allow for accurate identification and dating, and in any case were generic topics suitable for the second half of a panegyric devoted to the achievements of the emperor in times of peace, as prescribed by Menander.²¹ The inclusion of the Long Wall (21) does not provide decisive evidence for the dating of the panegyric, since the dating of the wall itself is so problematic.²² However, if, as argued previously, Anastasius began work on the wall after the 502 barbarian raid into Thrace, this provides a terminus post quem. As for a terminus ante quem, that no mention is made of the Persian war cannot be taken as significant, since the initial success of the Persians would hardly have made suitable material for an encomium. However, (as argued above in the case of Priscian) it is unlikely that Procopius would have passed up the opportunity to mention the later Roman successes, and even more unlikely that he would have omitted all mention of the building work at Dara, given that he refers to defensive building work in the east in the context of the Arab incursions (7) and other building projects (the Hierapolis aqueduct, the Caesarea harbour, the lighthouse at Alexandria and the Long Wall). It would therefore make sense to date Procopius' panegyric to 503/4, just after Priscian's poem, but still very much part of the period of rejuvenation and renovation in the first half of Anastasius' reign.²³

²¹ For Anastasius' legislation concerning family matters and the judiciary, see ch. 6, pp.222–223, but few of the laws passed are dated.

²² Cf. Kempen (1918) xxii–xxvi and Chauvot (1986) 95–96. Kempen argues that the Long Wall was begun in 499 and dates the panegyric from 501, failing to take into account the mention of the Roman success over the Arabs in 502 and the ban on pantomime dancing. Chauvot argues that the panegyric was composed in a time of peace and that it was delivered in the spring of 502 between the treaty with the Arabs and the beginning of the Persian war. However, this date is only made possible by his assigning of the Long Wall to the year 497 (pp.220–221, n.113) which, as argued previously in ch. 4, pp.107–108, is too early.

²³ Cf. Croke (1982b) 73–74.

Appendix C

The Popes and Patriarchs (491–518)

<i>Rome</i>	
Gelasius	492–496
Anastasius II	496–498
Symmachus	498–514
Hormisdas	514–523
<i>Constantinople</i>	
Euphemius	490–496
Macedonius	496–511
Timothy	511–518
John	518–520
<i>Antioch</i>	
Palladius	488–498
Flavian	498–512
Severus	512–518
<i>Jerusalem</i>	
Sallustius	486–494
Elias	494–516
John	516–528
<i>Alexandria</i>	
Athanasius	490–498
John II	498–505
John III	505–516
Dioscorus II	516–518

Appendix D

The 510/511 Formula of Satisfaction (τύπος τῆς πληροφορίας)¹

Ex epistula Anastasii imperatoris adversus omnes schismaticos qui (quae?) erat post (41) annum concilii Chalcedonensis.

Una est definitio fidei quam accipimus CCCXVIII sanctorum Patrum, qui Nicaeae congregati sunt, ea quae ostendit quia unus est e sancta Trinitate Dominus Noster Jesus Christus Verbum Dei, id quod incarnatum est e sancta et deipara Virgine Maria et inhumanatus est. Illam definitionem habuerunt CL sancti Patres, qui in Constantinopoli congregati sunt propter Sanctum Spiritum. Secundum illam etiam beata synodus (eorum) quae Ephesi congregati sunt et anathematizarunt Nestorium schismaticum et omnes qui secundum ipsum putant et credunt, sicut et epistula quae vocatur Henoticon Zenonis, orthodoxi imperatoris, item et epistula Joannis archiepiscopi Alexandriae ea quae ostendit eodem modo, in qua anathematizat tomum Leonis et qui transgressi sunt illam definitionem et duas naturas post unionem definiverunt super unum Christum. Nos, sicut accepimus a sanctis Patribus, non dicimus duas naturas, sed unam naturam incarnatam Deum Verbum confitemur, et anathematizamus synodum Chalcedonis, cum ipsa etiam Leonem et Tomum eius et eos qui dicunt Christum duos filios, unum ante tempora et alterum qui in fine temporis. Et (eos) qui dicunt post confessionem unionis duas naturas et duas personas et duas formas et duas proprietates et distinctiones etiam uniuscuiusque naturae opus, reicimus et anathematizamus quia adversus beati Cyrilli duodecim capita invenitur.

Anathematizamus Paulum Samosatenum et Diodorum et Theodorum et Nestorium et Theodoretum et Ghoutaris (Eutharius?) et Andrean et Hibam et Johannem Aegaeum et Barsaumam et Acacium Persam ... et Apollinarem et Eutychem et Sabellium et Arium et Eunomium et Macedonium et Manetem et Marcionem et Bardesanem et abominabiles doctrinas eorum et (eos) qui sicut ipsi credunt, nisi poenitentiam egerint, et omnes sectas quae pugnaverunt et pugnant adversus rectam fidem apostolicae Ecclesiae, et omnes qui non confitentur quia deigenitrix est Maria sancta Virgo, et ex ea incarnatus est et homo factus est immutabiliter et inexplicabili modo is, qui similis et filius est substantiae Dei Patris, et Filius naturae nostrae ipse secundum incarnationem. Et (eum qui) unus est ante incarnationem similiter et post incarnationem, sicut

antea diximus, unam naturam incarnati Dei Verbi confitemur, passus est ut homo et suis passionibus abstulit passiones nostras, et mortuus est et morte sua occidit mortem et mansit impassibilis et immortalis ut Deus. Ipse et Patri, qui misit eum, et Sancto Spiritui gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

The letter which was composed by Anastasius, the emperor, against all heretics. Whereas there is one definition of the faith which we hold due to the 318 holy fathers, who assembled in Nicaea, which teaches us that of the Holy Trinity one was our Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, who was made incarnate of the Holy and God-bearing Virgin Mary and was made man. This definition was also received by the holy 150 fathers, who assembled in Constantinople to discuss the Holy Spirit. And withal by the blessed council which met in Ephesus and anathematised Nestorius, the heretic, and all who think and believe with him, as also in the letter which is called the *Henotikon* of Zeno, the orthodox Emperor; likewise also in the letter of the blessed John, the archbishop of Alexandria; which have the following purport, namely, he anathematizes the *Tome* of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, which contravened the said definition and defined them to be two natures after their union in Christ.

But we, as we have received from the holy and true fathers, deny that there are two natures and confess that there is only one nature out of two, which was made incarnate God the Word; and we anathematise the Council of Chalcedon and along with it also Leo and his *Tome* and all those who assert that there are two Christs and two Sons, the one before all eternity and the other in these last times. And those who say that there are two natures, after admitting their union, and two persons and two modes and two properties, and two diversities or two several operations of the several natures — these we reject and anathematise, because they are found to be contrary to the *Twelve Chapters* of the blessed Cyril.

We anathematise Paul of Samosata and Diodore and Theodore and Nestorius and Theodoret and Lutharis and Andrew and Hibas and Kure and John of Egea and Bardsuma and Acacius the Persian and Apollinaris and Eutyches and Sabellius and Arius and Eunomius and Macedonius and Mani and Marcion and Bardesanes together with their filthy teachings. And we anathematise all who believe as they believe, unless they repent, and all heresies, which conflict or will conflict with the right faith of the Catholic Apostolic Church, and all who do not avow that Mary is the Mother of God, the Holy Virgin, and that from her was made flesh and became man unchangeable and inseparable he who is equal and is the Son of the substance of God the Father and was also the Son of our nature in virtue of his Incarnation. And one is that existed before the Incarnation; likewise was he [one] that existed after the Incarnation; as we said above, one nature of the incarnate God the Word we acknowledge. He suffered as a man and by his sufferings took away our sufferings; and he died and by his death slew death and remained impassible and immortal as God. To him and to the Father, who sent him, and to the Holy Spirit be glory to eternity of eternities. Amen.

¹ The first section is preserved in *Le sceau de la foi*, ed. K. Ter-Mekertschian, Eshmiadzin (1914) 128, and the second section in *Le livre des Lettres*, ed. J. Ismireantz, *Bibl. Sahag-Mesrobienne* 5 (1901) 277-278; for the Latin translation, see J. Lebon, 'Les citations patristiques dans le Sceau de la Foi', *RHE* 25 (1929) 5-32 and Moeller (1961) 240-247. An English translation of the first section is given by Grillmeier (1987) II.1.275; for this translation, Coleman-Norton (1966) 950-951.

Appendix E

Key Ministers and Officers (491–518)

The following lists of officials are based on those in the *PLRE* 1242–1307.

Consuls

491	Olybrius (East)
492	Anastasius I (East); Fl. Rufus (East)
493	Fl. Eusebius (East); (?Faustus) Albinus iunior (West)
494	Fl. Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius (West); Fl. Praesidius (West)
495	Fl. Viator (West)
496	Paulus (East)
497	Anastasius I (East)
498	John the Scythian (East); Paulinus (West)
499	John the Hunchback (East)
500	Fl. Patricius (East); Fl. Hypatius (East)
501	Pompeius (East); Fl. Avienus iunior (West)
502	Fl. Probus (East); Rufius Magnus Faustus Avienus iunior (West)
503	Fl. Dexicrates (East); Volusianus (West)
504	Fl. Rufius Petronius Nicomachus Cethegus (West)
505	Sabinianus (East); Fl. Theodorus (West)
506	Fl. Areobindus Dagalaifus Areobindus (East); Fl. Ennodius Messala (West)
507	Anastasius I (East); Venantius (West)
508	Celer (East); Basilius Venantius iunior (West)
509	Fl. Inportunus (West)
510	Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius iunior (West)
511	Fl. Secundinus (East); Fl. Felix (West)
512	Fl. Paulus (East); Moschianus (East)
513	Fl. Taurus Clementinus Armonius Clementinus (East); Fl. Probus (West)
514	Fl. Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator (West)
515	Procopius Anthemius (East); Florentius (West)
516	Fl. Petrus (West)
517	Fl. Anastasius Paulus Probus Sabinianus Pompeius Anastasius (East); Fl. Agapitus (West)
518	Fl. Anastasius Paulus Probus Moschianus Probus Magnus (East)

Honorary Consuls

497	Apion
498	John the Paphlagonian
pre 506	Areobindus

508	Clovis
pre 511	Clementinus
514	John, son of Valeriana

City Prefects of Constantinople

491	Julian
c.492	Secundinus
pre 494	Fl. Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius
500	Helias
501	Constantinus
498, ?507–512	Plato

Comites Sacrarum Largitionum (East)

498	John the Paphlagonian
?513	Clementinus

Magistri Officiorum (East)

492–497	Fl. Eusebius
503–518	Celer

Magistri Militum (East)

1. Magistri Praesentales

a) magistri peditum; patricii

492–499	John the Hunchback
503	Fl. Hypatius
513	Fl. Hypatius
514–515	John, son of Valeriana

b) magister equitum

500–518	Fl. Patricius
---------	---------------

2. Magistri Militum per Orientem

483–498	John the Scythian
503–504/5	Fl. Areobindus Dagailphus Areobindus
505–506	Pharesmanes
?516–518	Fl. Hypatius

3. Magistri Militum per Illyricum

491/518	John
499	Aristus
505	Sabinianus

Praetorian Prefects

491	Matronianus ¹
494–496	Hierius ²

¹ Matronius is addressed in several laws: *C.J.* VII.39.4, X.27.1, XI.62.14; *PLRE* II.736, no.2. Stein (1949) II.782 questions John of Antioch's claim (fr.95) that Matronius was Illus' brother-in-law.

² *C.J.* VI.21.16, Mal. 392; *PLRE* II.558, no.6.

496	Euphemius ³
498	Polycarp
502–505	Constantine ⁴
505–506	Eustathius ⁵
510	Leontius ⁶
511–512	Zoticus
512–515	Marinus ⁷
517	Sergius
undated	Apion ⁸
	Armenius
	Arcadius

Vindices

512/515	Potamon (Alexandria)
513/516	Alexander (Anazarbus)
513/516	Musonius (Anazarbus)
early VI	Dracontius
early VI	Martyrius
513/518	Theodorus (Tripolis)

³ Euphemius is addressed in three laws dated 1st and 30th April and 21st July, 496 (*C.J.* X.16.3, VIII.53.32, X.19.9). The first and third of these laws are addressed to an Anthemius, but this is more likely to be a corruption of *Euphemius* rather than a different prefect; cf. Stein (1949) II.782, *PLRE* II.424, no.3.

⁴ Constantine is addressed in several laws dated February and July, 502 (*C.J.* III.13.7, VI.20.18, VI.58.11, VIII.48.5), and then again on 1st January (or July), 505 (*C.J.* II.7.22). For the dating of this law, *PLRE* II.315, no.19.

⁵ Eustathius is addressed in several laws: *C.J.* I.4.19, II.7.23, IV.35.22.

⁶ The dating of Leontius' prefecture is uncertain, though John the Lydian indicates that he was in office when Apion was disgraced and exiled in 510; John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.17; Bury (1923) I.470, Stein (1949) II.782, Chauvot (1986) 140, *PLRE* II.672–673, no.23.

⁷ For discussion of the dating of Marinus' prefecture, cf. Chauvot (1986) 140–144. He held the post after Zoticus (Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.* LIV) and was referred to as ἀπὸ ἐπαρχῶν in 515 (Mal. 403–405). It is known that he was responsible for the creation of the *vindices* (pre 512) (John Lydus, *de Mag.* III.49, Mal. 400, Evag. III.42). It is possible that he introduced the *vindices* prior to taking up the position of prefecture (contra Chauvot); cf. ch. 6, p.207 n.123. For the 512–515 dating, Bury (1923) I.470, Stein (1949) II.782 and *PLRE* II.727.

⁸ For discussion on Apion, cf. ch. 6, p.192 n.41.

Appendix F

Legislation 491–518

The laws are numbered according to P. Krueger, *Codex Justinianus*, Berlin 1954, vol. II.

1	<i>C.J.</i> I.2.17	undated	Concerning churches, their property and privileges.
	<i>C.J.</i> I.2.18	undated	Concerning money assigned to the Great Church for funerals.
2	<i>C.J.</i> I.4.17	undated	Concerning the corn buyer.
	<i>C.J.</i> I.4.18	undated	Concerning soldiers and their <i>annona</i> .
	<i>C.J.</i> I.4.19	505	Concerning the <i>defensor</i> of the city.
3	<i>C.J.</i> I.5.11	510	Against Manichaeism.
4	<i>C.J.</i> I.22.6	491	Concerning judgement obtained fraudulently by petition.
5	<i>C.J.</i> I.29.4	undated	Concerning the office of the <i>magister militum</i> .
6	<i>C.J.</i> I.30.3	492	Concerning the duties of a <i>quaestor</i> .
7	<i>C.J.</i> I.34.1–3	undated	Concerning the administration of the <i>res privata</i> .
■	<i>C.J.</i> I.42.1	undated	Concerning the duties of the <i>magister officiorum</i> .
	<i>C.J.</i> I.42.2	?513	Concerning the duties of tribunes.
9	<i>C.J.</i> I.55.11 = <i>C.J.</i> I.4.19		
10	<i>C.J.</i> II.4.43	500	Concerning litigation for serfs and slaves.
11	<i>C.J.</i> II.7.20 <i>C.J.</i> II.7.21 <i>C.J.</i> II.7.22 <i>C.J.</i> II.7.23 <i>C.J.</i> II.7.24	497 500 505 506 517	Regulations for the advocates of various judges.
12	<i>C.J.</i> III.13.17	502	Concerning jurisdiction for high-ranking or privileged officials.
13	<i>C.J.</i> IV.29.21	517	Concerning women and their rights of hypothecation.
14	<i>C.J.</i> IV.35.22	506	Concerning action and counter-action in court cases.
15	<i>C.J.</i> V.17.9	497	Concerning regulations on divorce.
16	<i>C.J.</i> V.27.6	517	Concerning children and legitimacy.
17	<i>C.J.</i> V.30.4	498	Concerning legal guardianship.

18	C.J. V.62.25	499	Exemption for silentaries in guardianship.
19	C.J. V.70.5	Undated	Concerning guardianship of the insane.
20	C.J. VI.20.18	502	Concerning the duties of emancipated children.
21	C.J. VI.21.16	496	Regulations on the wills of soldiers.
22	C.J. VI.58.11	502	Concerning the rights of emancipated children.
23	C.J. VII.39.4 C.J. VII.39.5 C.J. VII.39.6	491 500 ?510 ¹	Concerning prescription of forty years.
24	C.J. VII.51.6	undated	Concerning the profits and expenses of litigation.
25	C.J. VIII.36.4	501	Concerning litigation.
26	C.J. VIII.48.5	502	Concerning the emancipation of children.
27	C.J. VIII.53.32	496	Concerning the registering of donations.
28	C.J. X.16.13	496	Concerning tributes in grain and in cash.
29	C.J. X.19.9 C.J. X.19.10	496 498	Concerning the collection of tribute.
30	C.J. X.27.1 C.J. X.27.2–3	491 undated	Concerning the <i>coemptio</i> .
31	C.J. X.32.66	497–499	Concerning <i>decurions</i> and their sons.
32	C.J. XI.1.1–2	498	Abolition of the <i>chrysargyron</i> .
33	C.J. XI.43.11	517 ²	Concerning the drawing of water from aqueducts.
34	C.J. XI.48.19	undated	Legislation to tie <i>coloni</i> of over thirty years service to their land.
35	C.J. XI.62.14	491	Concerning contracts or leases on imperial land or property.
36	C.J. XII.1.18	undated	Concerning the rights of magistrates travelling to Constantinople.
37	C.J. XII.5.5	undated	Concerning the rights of imperial chamberlains.
38	C.J. XII.10.2	undated	Concerning the counts of the consistory.
39	C.J. XII.16.5	497–499	Concerning the privileges of the silentaries.
40	C.J. XII.19.11–12	undated ³	Concerning the succession of imperial secretaries, and their privileges.

¹ This law is addressed to the praetorian prefect Leontius; for the dating, cf. n.7.

² Addressed to the praetorian prefect, Sergius, in office in 517.

³ C.J. XII.1.18, C.J. XII.5.5, C.J. XII.10.2, C.J. XII.19.11 are addressed to Eusebius, the *magister officiorum* 492–497.

41	C.J. XII.20.6	undated ⁴	Concerning the conduct of agents employed in the transaction of business.
42	C.J. XII.35.18	492	Concerning improved conditions for ordinary soldiers.
43	C.J. XII.37.16–19	undated	Concerning the distribution of military subsistence.
44	C.J. XII.49.12–13	undated	Concerning the privileges of praetorian tribunes.
45	C.J. XII.50.23	undated	Regulations on the use of the public post horses.
46	C.J. XII.54.5	undated	Concerning staff officers and generals and their privileges.

⁴ C.J. XII.19.12 and C.J. XII.20.6 are addressed to Celer, the *magister officiorum* attested in office 503–518.

Appendix G

Bibliographic Notes

There is only one study of the life and works of Anastasius, the Italian biography, *L'imperatore Anastasio I*, published in 1969 by Capizzi. As well as discussing Anastasius' background (chapters one to three), accession (four), and personality (seven), he covers the main aspects of the reign in one long chapter entitled *L'opera politica*, which includes the Isaurian war, religious policy, administrative and financial reforms and foreign policy. The emperor's building programme enjoys a separate chapter (six), in which buildings or sites built or restored by Anastasius are listed. Capizzi's analysis of Anastasius' reforms, while largely adequate, has some significant gaps. There is, for example, no section on Anastasius' army reforms, nor a cohesive discussion on the nature of faction rioting and the emperor's response to the problem. Consideration of other measures is severely limited: for example, the coinage reform is dealt with in three short paragraphs (pp.153–154).

Two books, Chauvot's *Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase I^{er}* (1986), and Coyne's *Priscian of Caesarea's De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris* (1991) provide useful discussion on events during the reign of Anastasius. Both (for obvious reasons) limit commentary to aspects of the reign which appear in the panegyrics, and naturally focus partly on Procopius and Priscian, their works, style and so on.

Separate aspects of Anastasius' rule have been covered in a number of books and articles.¹ One of the most useful of these is Charanis' study of Anastasius' religious policy, published originally in 1939 but revised in 1974. Charanis provides detailed background information, an account of the ecclesiastical disputes in the east, the revolt of Vitalian, the religious situation in the Balkans, and the doctrinal schism between the east and west. Anastasius' policy towards the west is the subject of a detailed study by Prostko-Prostyński (1994) who provides a close study of the relationship between the emperor and Theoderic.

Several works pertain to legislation, including Oliverio's detailed commentary on the decree concerning the *limitanei* in Libya. The

currency reform has sparked interest among numismatists, resulting in studies by Shaw (1963), Bellinger (1966), Grierson (1967) and Metcalf (1969). There are various articles on Anastasius' building programme, such as Barnea's work on the Balkans, and articles by Croke (1982), Whitby (1985), Crow (1993) and Crow and Ricci (1997) on the Anastasian Long Wall and by Croke/Crow (1983) and Whitby (1986) on the fortification of Dara. Alan Cameron (1974) and Chauvot (1977) have both published articles concerning the dating of Priscian's panegyric. Only one article, Lamma's 'La politica dell'imperatore Anastasio I', tackles the whole of Anastasius' reign. Thirty pages long, it provides little more than a superficial overview of the main issues of the reign with sparse accompanying discussion.

Apart from these individual studies, the Anastasian years are included within general histories of the Byzantine Empire, for example Bury's *History of the Later Roman Empire*, volume one of Vasiliev's *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, volume two of Stein's *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Ostrogorsky's *History of the Byzantine State*, Jones' *The Later Roman Empire 284–602*, volumes one and four of the *Cambridge Mediaeval History* and volume fourteen of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. Of these, Stein's work is undoubtedly the most detailed and even-handed, while Jones is equally helpful on administrative and financial matters. On the whole, the others provide a brief summary of the key aspects of the reign, usually acknowledging Anastasius' successful economic reforms, but emphasising the theological turmoil. They portray the reign in a negative light, particularly in contrast to Justinian's. Bréhier's entry on Anastasius in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* (1914) is fairly detailed and positive in its assessment of the emperor's efforts, but lacks the advantages of the considerable amount of research and interest in Byzantine history generated since the beginning of the last century.

Works which focus on particular aspects of this period of Late Antiquity may also be mined for discussion on Anastasius. For eastern foreign policy, imperial relations with the Arabs are covered by Shahîd in his detailed books on Byzantium and the Arabs in the fifth and sixth centuries and by Fowden in *The Barbarian Plain: St. Sergius between Rome and Iran*; while accounts of the Anastasian war against Persia can be found in Blockley's *East Roman Foreign Policy*, and especially in Greatrex's study on *Rome and Persia at war, 502–532*. Aspects of western policy may be found in various books devoted to the life of Theoderic or to religious policy (for which see below). Useful biographies of Theoderic and studies on the Ostrogoths include those by Hodgkin (1891 and 1895), Caspar (1931), Brion (1935), and more

¹ Other key studies were composed at the turn of the last century: Rose's *Die byzantinische Kirchenpolitik unter Kaiser Anastasius I* (1888) and Merten's *De bello Persico ab Anastasio gesto* (1906).

recently, Jones (1962), Burns (1984), Moorhead (1992) and Amory (1997), although these are naturally written from the point of view of Theoderic. Anastasius' relations with Clovis are dealt with in most of the above works, and there are also helpful articles by Ensslin (1936) and Courcelle (1948–1949). Notably, there are hardly any works which provide a synthesis of Anastasius' foreign policy. Rubin, in his article 'The Mediterranean and the dilemma of the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity', is one of few to address the question of how to maintain the eastern empire, while regaining the west.² Separate studies of either the east or west fail to recognise the stabilising effect of Anastasius' policy of deliberate non-expansion or the dangers of overexerting the empire's resources which resulted in the eventual failure of Justinian's ambitious plans of reconquest.

A huge amount of material exists on theological matters, which again incorporates the reign of Anastasius. The list is far too long to detail here, but includes works pertaining to the west and the papacy: Brezzi (1936) and Dvornik (1951) on Gelasius' policy, Alessandrini (1944) and Cessi (1919) and (1920) on the Laurentian schism, and two articles by Bertolini (1929) and (1941) on the political and ecclesiastical situation in Rome. Studies on religion in the east tend to focus on particular figures, such as Severus (Bauer's 'Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor'), and Philoxenus (de Halleux's *Philoxène de Mabbog*), but useful general books include Honigsmann's *Evêques et Evêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e siècle*. There is a limited number of concentrated surveys of Anastasius' handling of the ecclesiastical crisis from his point of view. Those that come closest are Bardy's chapter entitled 'Sous le régime de l'Hénotique: la politique religieuse d'Anastase' in Fliche's and Martin's *Histoire de l'église* (1948), Moeller's article, 'Un fragment du Type de l'empereur Anastase I' and the relevant chapters of Duchesne's *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle*, Frend's *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* and Gray's *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*.

While it is generally agreed that Anastasius' economic and administrative legislation was successful, few have considered the reforms as a cohesive policy. Again, analysis must be sought either in general studies of the period, such as those of Karayannopoulos (1958), Jones (1974), Lemerle (1979), Hendy (1985), Delmaire (1989), Kaplan (1992), Treadgold (1995) and Harl (1996), or in articles on more specific measures: for example, Karayannopoulos (1956) on the *chrysoteleia*,

Monks (1957) on the *res privata*, Claude (1969) and Chrysos (1971) on the introduction of the *vindices*, and Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963), Callu (1982), Durliat and Guillou (1984) and Dagron (1985) on customs taxes. Useful discussion of Anastasius' policy on the faction riots which erupted during his reign is found in Cameron's two books, *Porphyrius, the Charioteer* and *Circus Factions*. Less helpful studies are conducted by Jarry (1960 and 1966) who attempts to trace Anastasius' social and religious inclinations from his treatment of the factions. There are a number of recent studies which consider the late Roman city, including Liebeschuetz, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City* (2001), Alston, *The City in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (2002) and Laniado, *Recherches sur les notables municipaux dans l'empire protobyzantin* (2002).

Access to the study of the reign of Anastasius has been enormously helped by the publication of several recent translations and commentaries of key primary sources. Of particular importance are the editions of Theophanes (OUP 1997); Malalas (1986) and Marcellinus Comes (1995) published by the Australian Association for Byzantine Studies; and the *Chronicon Paschale* (1989), Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre (1996), Evagrius (2000), and Joshua Stylites (2000) published in the Liverpool Translated Texts for Historians series. Studies which include text, translation, commentary and general discussion exist for important texts such as John the Lydian's *de Magistratibus Populi Romani* (Carney 1971) and the *Oracle of Baalbek* (Alexander 1967). Other useful sources appear in the Loeb series: the *Anthologia Graeca*, the Anonymus Valesianus and the works of Procopius of Caesarea.

² Rubin has also published an interesting article in the *BAR* series (1989) exploring Anastasius' relations with Southern Arabia.

GLOSSARY

Acacian schism: schism between the eastern patriarchs (especially Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople) who accepted the *Henoticon* (q.v.) and the pope who did not.

actuarii: military quartermaster.

adaeratio: commutations of tax from payments in kind to cash.

adiectio sterilius: annexation of unproductive land.

adscripticius: term used in the east for ■ tenant of a house — though by the sixth century there was little practical difference from a *colonus* (q.v.). See also *inquilinus*.

agens in rebus: imperial agent.

annona: food rations.

archimandrite: superior of ■ large monastery.

Arians: adherents of Arius, priest of Alexandria. Arius denied the full divinity of Christ, arguing that He had been created by God and was therefore inferior to Him. This view was condemned at the Council of Nicaea in 325.

assessor: legal adviser.

augustalis: vicar of the diocese of Egypt and responsible to the emperor (not the praetorian prefect).

aurum coronarium: gold paid by cities to the emperor on his accession, quinquennial anniversaries and other celebratory occasions.

aurum oblativum: gold paid by the senate to the emperor on the same occasions as the *aurum coronarium*.

aurum tironicum: gold levy paid in lieu of providing recruits.

bona caduca: estates left to the unmarried or childless.

bona damnatorum: estates of condemned criminals.

bona vacantia: estates left to those dying intestate.

bucellarius: elite soldier serving a particular Roman general.

cancellarius: personal assistant to a magistrate.

capitatio: poll-tax.

capitus: fodder rations.

chartularius: an administrator (secretary or accountant) in the office of the praetorian prefect.

chrysargyron: gold tax imposed on *negotiatores* (those who made a living by buying, selling or charging fees) and which particularly affected the urban poor.

clarissimus: grade of senatorial order.

coemptio (συνωνή): the compulsory purchase of rations.

collatio glebalis: gold tax imposed on senators.

collatio lustralis: see *chrysargyron*.

colonus: tenant of a farm.
comes consistoriani: chief civilian minister of the consistory, ■ council of state and high court of justice.
comes domesticorum: high-ranking military commander of the guards (infantry and cavalry) stationed at the imperial palace.
comes foederatorum: commander of the allied (federate) forces.
comes Orientis: the Count (civilian official) of the East.
comes rei militari: a military commander.
comes rei privatae / *comes rerum privatarum*: count of the private estates (of the emperor).
comes sacrarum largitionum: count of the Sacred Largesse — imperial official in charge of the central treasury, mints, mines and customs.
comes sacri patrimonii / *comes patrimonii*: count of the sacred patrimony — chief administrator of the emperor's personal property.
comitatenses: (mobile) Roman field army.
commerciarius: official in charge of controlling foreign trade.
compulsor: official sent to collect tax arrears.
 consubstantiality (*homoousios*): 'of same substance' — term used to describe the relationship between God the Father and God the Son.
 Council of Chalcedon: Council held in 451 at which the formula (Christ was one person in two natures. the divine consubstantial with the Father; the human consubstantial with man) was agreed.
 Creed of Constantinople: the definition of faith agreed at the Council of Constantinople in 381 at which the views of Arius (see Arians) and Apollinaris, the bishop of Laodicea, were considered to be heretical.
cubicularius: eunuch who served the sacred bedchamber of the emperor in the imperial palace.
curator (λογιστής): official in charge of municipal finances.
curia / *curiales*: provincial town council / councillors.
decuriones: provincial town councillors (cf. *curiales*).
defensor (ἐκδικος): imperial official who looked after the interests of the lower classes, especially against those of the upper class landowners and provincial governors.
 Diptychs: lists of names read out during the prayers in the liturgy. Only those considered members of the Church would be included on the lists and therefore Chalcedonian bishops would exclude monophysites and monophysite bishops would exclude Chalcedonians.
dromones: supply ships.
dux (*duces*): provincial military commander(s).
epibole, ἐπιβολή: tax paid by the community of abandoned or uncultivated land.
 Eutychians: followers of Eutyches, an archimandrite (q.v.) of Constantinople, who had come to believe in an extreme form of monophysitism (q.v.) which challenged the view that Christ's humanity was 'consubstantial' (see consubstantiality) with man's. He was deposed at a synod in Constantinople in 447.
exactor civitatis: official who directed tax collection from provincial cities.
excubitor: palace guard.

foederati (federates): allied soldiers serving in the Roman army through a *foedus* (treaty).
Henoticon: Letter of Zeno (482) which affirmed the Nicene Creed (q.v.) and the Creed of Constantinople (q.v.) and the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril, condemned Nestorius and Eutyches (see Eutychians), ignored the Tome of Leo (q.v.) and avoided the question of the natures in/of Christ.
homoousios: see consubstantiality.
hypostasis: 'substance' — term used to describe and define the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
illustris: highest rank of senator.
inquilinus: term used in the west for a tenant of a house (see also *adscripticius*).
 Jacobites: Syrian monophysites called after the sixth-century Jacob Baradaeus.
kathisma: ■ complex of rooms built on three levels in the hippodrome at Constantinople which included the royal box.
limitanei: soldiers based on the frontier.
 λογιστής: see *curator*.
logothete: minister in charge of public services (usually financial).
magister equitum: master of the cavalry — high ranking general in charge of the cavalry.
magister memoriae: chief legal advisor and foreign minister.
magister militum: master of the soldiers — general of high rank of ■ large army e.g. in the Balkans (*magister militum per Thracias*), on the eastern frontier (*magister militum per Orientem*).
magister militum praesentalis: general stationed at Constantinople.
magister officiorum: master of offices — high ranking imperial official in charge of the civil service.
 Manichees: followers of the third-century Persian gnostic Mani who believed in a dualist (good vs evil) view of the world. Manichaeism was viewed as heretical and outlawed in imperial legislation throughout the fourth and fifth centuries.
 Monophysites: those who believed in the doctrine that Christ possessed only one nature (ie. his two natures — divine and human — were not distinguished). This doctrine was contrary to the definition of faith agreed at Chalcedon in 451 but was followed by those in the eastern provinces, especially Egypt.
 Nestorians: followers of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, who denied that the Virgin Mary was the *theotokos* (Mother of God) and accepted the duality of natures (human and divine) of Christ. Nestorius was deposed at the Council of Ephesus in 431.
 Nicene Creed: the definition of faith agreed at the Council of Nicaea in 325 which emphasised the equality of God the Father and God the Son.
 Novel: a new law passed by an emperor.
 ἐκδικος: see *defensor*.
officina: a subdivision of the principal mints.
optio (pl. *optiones*): military quartermaster.
originarius: a *colonus* (tenant) tied to the land by his *origo*.

pagarch: curial official in charge of tax collection with increased powers in the sixth century.

patrimonium: ministry created by Anastasius to administer private property allocated to the state treasury.

phylarch: military commander of allied (especially Arab) troops.

praepositus sacri cubiculi: chief chamberlain of the imperial palace.

praetorian prefect: highest civil administrator. During the reign of Anastasius there were two praetorian prefects —of the east, and of Illyricum.

procurator monetarum: official in charge of the imperial mint.

protector: high-ranking soldier.

quaestor: minister in charge of legal matters.

res privata: financial department primarily concerned with the administration of the emperor's personal property.

sacrae largitiones: financial department primarily concerned with the administration of public revenues.

scholae: guards at the imperial palace.

scrinia: departments within ministries (eg. *scrinium orientis*, the financial sub-department of the praetorian prefect).

silentiary: palace official of high rank.

sitona: municipal corn buyer.

Sleepless Monks: order of monks who practised perpetual prayer in relays. Firmly pro-Chalcedonian.

spahbadh: general of the Persian army.

spectabilis: grade of senatorial order.

sportulae: fees.

συνωνίη: see *coemptio*.

symmachoi: allies (Greek term); cf. *foederati*.

Tome of Leo: dogmatic letter sent in 449 by Pope Leo to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, in which he laid down his profession of faith that in Christ there were two natures, one personality, and criticised Flavian for the way he had dealt with Eutyches. The letter was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon (q.v.).

tractator: official of the praetorian prefecture, often concerned with tax collection.

triklinos: hall for receptions.

Trishagion: the refrain. "Holy God, Holy mighty, Holy immortal, have mercy upon us" in the eastern liturgy. The phrase "who was crucified for us" was added by Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch, and became a monophysite slogan.

vindex: imperial official in charge of tax collection, appointed by the praetorian prefect.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Acta Synhodorum Habitarum Romae* ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH AA XII* (1884).
- Agapius of Manbidj. *Kitab al-'Unvan (Histoire Universelle, écrite par Agapius de Menbidj)*, tr. A.A. Vasiliev, *PO 8* (1912) 397–550.
- Agathias. *Historiae*, ed. R. Keydell, Berlin 1967.
- Aimon of Fleury. *Historia Francorum*, *PL 139* (1880) cols. 627–798.
- Ammianus Marcellinus. *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui Supersunt*, tr. J.C. Rolfe, London and Camb. Mass. 1935–1939, 3 vols.
- Anna Comnena. *Alexiadis*, ed. L. Schopenus, Bonn 1878.
- Anonymus Valesianus (Anon. Val.). *Excerpta Valesiana*, edd. J. Moreau and V. Velkov, Leipzig 1968.
- tr. J.C. Rolfe, London and Camb. Mass. 1939, vol.3.
- Anthologia Graeca (Anthol. Graec.)*. *Anthologia Graeca*, ed. and tr. W.R. Paton, London and New York 1927, 5 vols.
- Antoninus of Placentia. *Itinera Hierosolymitana, saeculi IV–VIII*, ed. P. Geyer, Leipzig–Vienna–Prague 1898, repr. New York and London 1964, 159–191.
- Athanasius (*Vit. Sev.*). *The Conflict of Severus, patriarch of Antioch*, edd. E.J. Goodspeed and W.E. Crum, *PO 4* (1908) 569–726.
- Avitus. *Opera Omnia*, *PL 59* (1847) cols.199–398; ed. R. Peiper, *MGH AA VI.2* (1883).
- Candidus (Candid.). *Fragments*, ed. and tr. R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, Liverpool 1981–1983, 2 vols.
- Cassiodorus, *Chronicle (Cass., Chron.)*. *Chronicon*, *PL 69* (1865) cols. 1213–1248.
- Cassiodorus, *Variae (Cass., Var.)*. *Variae* ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH AA XII* (1894).
- tr. T. Hodgkin, *The Letters of Cassiodorus*, London 1886.
- tr. S.J.B. Barnish, *The Variae of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator*, Liverpool 1992.
- Cedrenus (Cedr.). *Compendium Historiarum*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn 1838, vol.I.
- Chronicle of Arbela*. 'Die Chronik von Arbela — Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des ältesten Christentums im Orient', tr. P. Kawerau, [CSCO t.200], Louvain 1985.

- Chronicon Miscellaneum ad A.D. 724 pertinens* (*Chronicon ad 724*). *Chronicon Miscellaneum ad A.D. 724 pertinens*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, [CSCO ser.3, t.4, part 2], Paris 1903.
- Chronicon ad A.D. 819 pertinens* (*Chronicon ad 819*). *Chronicon ad A.D. 819 pertinens*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, [CSCO ser.3, t.14], Louvain 1952.
- Chronicon ad A.D. 846 pertinens* (*Chronicon ad 846*). *Chronicon ad A.D. 846 pertinens*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, [CSCO ser.3, t.4, part 2], Paris 1903.
- Chronicon anonymum ad a.c. 1234 pertinens* (*Chronicon ad 1234*). *Chronicon anonymum ad a.c. 1234 pertinens*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, [CSCO ser.3, t.14], Louvain 1952.
- Chronicon Edessenicum*. *Chronicon Edessenicum* tr. I. Guidi, [CSCO ser.3, t.4, part 1], Paris 1903.
- Chronicon Paschale* (*Chron. Pasch.*). ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn 1832
tr. and comm. M. and M. Whitby, Liverpool 1989.
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (*De Cer.*). *De Ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, ed. J.J. Reiske, Bonn 1829.
- Corippus. *In Laudem Iustini minoris libri quattuor*, tr. Averil Cameron, London 1976.
- Corpus Iuris Civilis*.
Codex Iustinianus (C.J.) (= vol. II). Krueger (1954). P. Krueger, ed. *Codex Iustinianus*, Berlin, repr.
Novels (= vol. III). Schoell and Kroll (1954). R. Schoell and W. Kroll, ed. *Novels*, Berlin, repr.
Scott (1932). S.P. Scott, *The Civil Law*, Cincinnati.
- Cyril of Scythopolis (Cyril of Scythop. *Vit. Sab.: Life of St. Sabas; Vit. Abrah.: Life of Abraham; Vit. Ioh.: Life of John*). ed. E. Schwartz, Kyrillos von Skythopolis, Leipzig 1939
tr. and comm. A.J. Festugière, *Le moines d'Orient; les moines de Palestine* III/1–3, Paris 1962–1963.
- Damascius. *Vitae Isidori Reliquae*, ed. C. Zintzen, Hildesheim 1967.
- Elias of Nisibis. *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni Opus Chronologicum*, pars prior, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, [CSCO ser.3, t.7], Rome–Paris–Leipzig 1910.
- Ennodius (Ennod. *Pan.: Panegyric; Vit. Epiph.: Life of Epiphanius*). *Magni Felicis Enodii Opera*, ed. F. Vogel, MGH AA VII (1885).
- Epistolae Austrasicae*, in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, I, MGH, *Epistularum tomus 3*, ed. W. Gundlach, Berlin 1892.
- Eusebius (Euseb. *Vit. Const.: Life of Constantine*). *Vita Constantini*, PL 8 (1844) cols.9–92.
- Eustathius of Epiphaneia (Eustath.). *Fragments*, ed. C. Müller, FHG IV: 138–142.
- Eutychius. *Annales*, PG 111 (1863) cols.907–1156.
- Evagrius (Evag.). *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London 1898
tr. and comm. M. Whitby, Liverpool 2000.
- Ferrandus. *Vita Fulgentii*, PL 65 (1847) cols. 117–150.

- Georgius Monachus (Georg. Mon.). *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1904; P. Wirth, Stuttgart 1978.
- Gregory bar Hebraeus. *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj* (*Bar Hebraeus*), tr. E.A.W. Budge, London 1932, vol. I.
- Gregory, bishop of Tours (Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Fr.: History of the Franks*). *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Libri Historiarum X*, ed. B. Krusch *Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum* I.1 (1937–1951), 3 vols; tr. O.M. Dalton, Oxford 1927, vol. II.
- Herodotus. *Histories*, ed. C. Hude, Oxford 1955, repr.
- Histoire Nestorienne* (*Hist. Nest., Nestorian History*). *Histoire Nestorienne* (*Chronicle of Seert*), ed. A. Scher, PO 7 (1911) 93–203.
- Homer. *Iliad*, ed. M.M. Willcock, London 1978.
- Ibn Habīb. *al-Muhabbar*, ed. I. Lichtenstädter, Hyderabad 1942.
- James of Edessa, *Chronicle* (*Chron.*). *The Chronological Canon*, tr. E.W. Brooks, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 53 (1899) 261–327.
- James of Edessa, *Hymns. The Hymns of Severus and others in the Syriac version of Paul of Edessa as revised by James of Edessa*, tr. E.W. Brooks, PO 7 (1911) 593–805.
- Jerome, *Epistles* (ep.). *Epistles*, PL 22 (1864) cols.325–1224.
- John of Antioch (John of Ant.). *Fragments*, ed. C. Müller, FHG IV: 535–622 and V: 27–38.
Mommmsen (1872). Th. Mommmsen, 'Bruchstücke des Johannes von Antiochia und des Johannes Malalas', *Hermes* 6: 323–383.
- John of Beith-Aphthonia (John, *Vit. Sev.: Life of Severus*). *Vie de Sévère*, tr. M. Kugener, PO 2 (1907) 205–264.
- John Chrysostom, *Epistles* (ep.). *Epistolae*, PG 52 (1862) cols.529–791.
- John of Ephesus (John of Eph.). Nau (1897). F. Nau, 'Analyse de la seconde partie inédite de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Jean d'Asie', *ROC* 2: 455–493.
- John of Ephesus, *Lives. Lives of Eastern Saints*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, PO 17 (1923) 1–306; 18 (1924) 511–698; 19 (1926) 151–285.
- John the Lydian (John Lydus, *de Mag.: de Magistratibus*). *De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, ed. R. Wuensch, Leipzig 1903.
Carney (1971). T. F. Carney, *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine bureaucracies viewed from within*, Kansas.
- Bandy (1983). A.C. Bandy, *Iohannes Lydus on Powers, or Magistracies of the Roman State*, Philadelphia.
- John Moschus. *Pratum Spirituale*, PG 87.3 (1863) cols.2847–3116.
- John of Nikiu. *Chronicle of John, bishop of Nikiu*, tr. R.H. Charles, London 1916.
- Jordanes (Jord. *Rom.: Romana; Get.: Getica*). *Romana and Getica*, ed. Th. Mommmsen, MGH AA V.1 (1882).
- Mierow (1966). C.C. Mierow, *The Gothic History of Jordanes in English version*, Cambridge and New York.
- Joshua the Stylite (Josh.). *Chronicle*, ed. and tr. W. Wright, Cambridge 1882.



- tr. J. Watt and F. Trombley, Liverpool 2000.
- Landolfus Sagax. *Additamenta ad Pauli Historiam Romanam*, ed. H. Droysen, *MGH AA II* (1879).
- Liber Pontificalis. Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1955 (2nd edition), vol. I.
- Liberatus (Brev.). *Breviarium Causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, *PL* 68 (1866) cols.969–1052.
- Malalas (Mal.). *Chronographia*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn 1831.
John Malalas, the Chronicle, tr. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne (1986).
- Malalas (Mal. *de insid.: excerpta de insidiis*). Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Excerpta de insidiis*, ed. C. de Boor, *Excerpta Historica*, Berlin 1905.
- Malchus (Malch.). *Fragments*, ed. and tr. R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, Liverpool 1981–1983, 2 vols.
- Marcellinus Comes (Marc. C.). *Chronicle*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH AA XI* (1894).
Croke (1995). B. Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, Sydney.
- Menander Rhetor. *The Imperial oration*, ed. and tr. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, Oxford 1981.
- Michael Glycas (Mich. Glycas). *Opera Omnia*, *PG* 158 (1866) cols.28–958.
- Michael the Syrian (Mich. Syr.). *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche d'Antioche 1166–1199*, tr. J.-B. Chabot, Paris 1899–1910.
- Narrationes Variae. Narrationes Variae*, tr. I. Guidi and E.W. Brooks, [*CSCO* ser.3, t.4, part 3], Paris 1903.
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (Niceph. Cal.). *Ecclesiastical History*, *PG* 145 (1865) cols.603–1332; 146 (1865); 147 (1865) cols.9–448.
- Nonnosus. *Fragments*, ed. C. Müller, *FHG IV*: 178–180.
The Oracle of Baalbek, ed. P.J. Alexander, Washington 1967.
- Paul the Deacon (Paul, *Hist. Rom.*). *Historia Romana*, ed. H. Droysen, *MGH AA II* (1879).
- Paul of Elusa. *Vita Theognii, Analecta Bollandiana* 10 (1891).
- Philostorgius. *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez and F. Winkelmann, Berlin 1981 (3rd edition).
- Philoxenus of Mabboug. *Discourses*, ed. and tr. E.A.W. Budge, London 1894.
- Pliny, *Epistles (ep.)*. *Epistularum Libri Decem*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford 1963.
- Priscian of Caesarea (Prisc. Pan.: *Panegyric*). *De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris*, tr. and comm., A. Chauvot, *Procopé de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase I^{er}*, Bonn 1986
tr. and comm. P. Coyne, *Priscian of Caesarea's De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris*, Lampeter 1991.
- Endlicher (1828). S.L. Endlicher, *Prisciani Grammatici de Laude Imperatoris Anastasii, et de Ponderibus et Mensuris Carmina*, Vienna.
- Priscus of Pannium (Prisc.). *Fragments*, ed. and tr. R.C. Blockley, *The Frag-*

- mentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, Liverpool 1981–1983, 2 vols.
- Procopius of Caesarea, (Proc. B.P.: *Persian Wars*; B.V.: *Vandal Wars*; B.G.: *Gothic Wars*; de Aed.: *Buildings*; Anec.: *Secret History*). *Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Hauray, rev. G. Wirth, Leipzig 1963–1964
ed. and tr. H.B. Dewing, 7 vols., London 1914–1940.
- Procopius of Gaza (Proc. Pan.: *Panegyric*). *Panegyricus in imperatorem Anastasium*, tr. and comm., A. Chauvot, *Procopé de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase I^{er}*, Bonn 1986.
Kempen (1918). C. Kempen, *Procopii Gazaei in imperatorem Anastasium panegyricus*, Diss., Bonn.
- Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre (Ps.-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre). *Chronicle*, part III, tr. W. Witakowski, Liverpool 1996.
The Chronicle of Zuqnin Parts III and IV, AD 488–775, tr. with notes and introduction A. Harrak, *Mediaeval sources in translation* 36, Toronto 1999.
- Scriptores Historiae Augustae (Historia Augusta)*. *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. and tr. David Magie, London and New York 1921–1932, 3 vols.
- Severus of Antioch (Sel. Let.). *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus patriarch of Antioch*, ed. E.W. Brooks, London 1903–1904.
Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts, ed. E.W. Brooks, *PO* 12 (1919) 173–342 and 14 (1920) 1–310.
- Severus of Antioch, *Philalethes. Sévère d'Antioche, Le Philalèthe*, ed. R. Hespel, [*CSCO* t.69, vol.134], Louvain 1952.
Kugener (1907). M. Kugener, 'Extraits, Notices et Poésies sur Sévère', *PO* 2: 265–400.
- Severus of Antioch (Hom. Cath.). *Les Homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, ed. and tr. R. Duval et al., *PO* (1906–1976).
- Severus of Ashmunain (*Hist. of Alex. Patriarchs*). *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, ed. B. Evetts, *PO* 1 (1907) 381–518.
- Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*, ed. and tr. H.L. Jones, Camb. Mass. and London 1917–1960, 8 vols.
- Suidae Lexicon (Souda)*. *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, 5 vols., Leipzig 1928–1938.
- Le Synaxaire Arabe Jacobite. Le Synaxaire Arabe Jacobite*, tr. R. Basset, *PO* 16 (1922) 185–424.
- Tabari. *Chronique de Tabari trad. sur la version persane*, H. Zotenberg, Paris 1867–1874, 4 vols.
- Tacitus. *Historiarum Libri*, C.D. Fisher, Oxford 1911.
- Theodore Lector (Theod. Lect.). *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1971.
Miller (1873). E. Miller, ed., 'Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Egée', *Revue Archéologique* 26: 273–288.
- Diekamp (1903). F. Diekamp, 'Zu Theodorus Lektor', *HJG* 24: 553–558.

- Theodoret of Cyrrhus (Theod., *History of the Monks of Syria*). *Histoire des moines de Syrie*, ed. and tr. P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, Paris 1977–1979, 2 vols.
- Price (1985). R.M. Price, *A History of the Monks of Syria*, Kalamazoo.
- Theodosius. *De situ Terrae Sanctae*, ed. P. Geyer, Turnhout 1965.
- Theophanes (Theoph.). *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1883.
- Mango and Scott (1997). C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronography of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A.D. 284–813*, Oxford.
- Victor of Tunnuna (Vict. Tunn.). *Chronicle*, PL 68 (1866) cols. 941–962 ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA XI (1894).
- Vita Danielis Stylitae* (V. Dan. Styl.: *Life of Daniel the Stylite*). tr. and comm. A.J. Festugière, *Le moines d'Orient; les moines de la région de Constantinople II*, Paris 1961.
- Dawes and Baynes (1948). E. Dawes and N.H. Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints; contemporary biographies*, Oxford.
- Vita S. Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis* (Vit. Fulgentii: *Life of Fulgentius*). *Vita S. Fulgentii episcopi Ruspensis*, PL 65 (1847) cols. 117–150.
- Ya'qūbī. *Historiae*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1883, 2 vols.
- Zachariah of Mytilene (Zach. of Myt.). *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, tr. E.W. Brooks, [CSCO ser.3, t.5–6], Paris 1919–1924.
- Zacharias Scholasticus (Zach., Vit. Sev.: *Life of Severus*). *Vie de Sévère*, tr. M. Kugener, PO 2 (1907) 3–115.
- Zonaras (Zon.). *Epitome Historiarum*, ed. M. Pindar and Th. Büttner-Wobst, Bonn 1841–1897.
- Zosimus (Zos.). *Zosime. Histoire Nouvelle*, ed. and tr. F. Paschoud, Paris 1971–1989.
- Zosimus, New History. A translation with commentary*, Ronald T. Ridley, Sydney 1982.

Secondary Sources

- Abel, F.M. (1938). 'L'île de Jotabè', *Revue Biblique* 47: 510–538.
- Abramowski, L. (1965). 'La prétendue condamnation de Diodore de Tarse en 499', *RHE* 60: 64–65.
- Adontz, N. (1970). *Armenia in the Period of Justinian: the political conditions based on the "Naxarar" system*, tr. and rev. N.G. Garsoïan, Lisbon.
- Ahrweiler, H. (1961). 'Fonctionnaires et bureaux maritimes à Byzance', *Revue des études byzantines (Mélanges R. Janin)* 19: 239–252, reprinted in *Études sur les structures administratives et sociales de Byzance*, London 1971, no.II.
- Aigrain, R. (1924). 'Arabie', *DHGE*, vol.III, cols.1158–1339.
- Alessandrini, A. (1944). 'Teoderico e Papa Simmaco durante lo scisma

- Laurenziano', *ASRS* 67: 153–207.
- Alexander, P.J. (1967). *The Oracle of Baalbek*, Washington.
- Allen, P. (1980). 'Zachariah Scholasticus and the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus', *JTS* n.s. 31: 471–488.
- (1981). *Evagrius Scholasticus, the church historian*, Louvain.
- (1988). 'An early epitomator of Josephus: Eustathius of Epiphaneia', *BZ* 81: 1–11.
- Alston, R. (2002). *The city in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, London and New York.
- Alt, A. (1921). 'Die griechischen Inschriften der Palaestina Tertia westlich der 'Araba', *Wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen des Deutsch-Türkischen Denkmalschutz-Kommandos*, II, Berlin and Leipzig, 4–13.
- (1923). 'Die neuen Inschriften aus der Palaestina Tertia', *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 46: 52–53.
- Amory, P. (1997). *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554*, Cambridge.
- Antoniadis-Bibicou, H. (1963). *Recherches sur les douanes à Byzance, l'octava, le kommerkion et les commerçants*, Paris.
- Armstrong, G.T. (1969). 'Fifth- and sixth-century church building in the Holy Land', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 14: 17–30.
- Bachrach, B.S. (1970). 'Procopius and the chronology of Clovis' Reign', *Viator* 1: 21–31.
- Bagnall, R.S. (1992). 'The periodicity and collection of the Chrysargyron', *Tyche* 7: 15–17.
- Bandy, A.C. (1983). *Iohannes Lydus on Powers, or Magistracies of the Roman State*, Philadelphia.
- Bar-Nathan, R. and Mazar, G. (1992). 'The Bet Shean Excavation Project (1989–1991): City Centre (south) and Tel Iztabba Area', *ESI* 11: 42–44.
- Bardill, J. and Greatrex, G. (1996). 'Antiochus the *praepositus*: ■ Persian eunuch at the court of Theodosius II', *DOP* 50: 171–197.
- Bardy, G. (1948). 'Sous le régime de l'Hénotique: la politique religieuse d'Anastase', in *Histoire de l'église*, edd. A.Fliche and V. Martin, Paris, vol.IV, 'De la mort de Théodose à élection de Grégoire le Grand', part 2, chapter 2, 229–320.
- Barnea, I. (1958). 'Roman – Byzantine Basilicae discovered in Dobrogea between 1948–1958', *Dacia* 2: 331–349.
- (1960). 'Contributions to Dobrudja History under Anastasius I', *Dacia* 4: 363–374.
- (1971). 'Dinogetia et Noviodunum, deux villes byzantines du Bas-Danube', *RESE* 9, no.3: 343–362.
- Barnwell, P.S. (1992). *Emperor, Prefects and Kings*, London.
- Bartoli, A. (1949–1950). 'Lavori nella sede del senato romano al tempo di Teoderico', *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma* 73: 77–90.

- Bauer, W. (1967). 'Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor', in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Strecker, Tübingen, 210–228.
- Baynes, N.H. (1925). 'The Vita S. Danielis Stylitae', *EHR* 40: 397–402.
- (1926). 'Alexandria and Constantinople: ■ study in ecclesiastical diplomacy', *JEA* 12: 145–156.
- Bell, G. (1982). *The Churches and Monasteries of the Tur 'Abdin*, with introduction and notes by M.M. Mango, London.
- Bellinger, A. (1966). 'The Copper of Anastasius I', *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 12: 84–87.
- Bendall, S. (1998). 'A new silver coinage in the name of Anastasius I (AD 491–517)', *Numismatic Circular* 106.9: 390–391.
- Bercham, D. van (1954). 'Recherches sur la chronologie des enceintes de Syrie et de Mésopotamie', *Syria* 31: 254–270.
- Bernard, A. (1966). *Alexandrie la Grande*, Paris.
- Bertolini, O. (1929). 'L'aristocrazia senatoria e il senato di Roma come forza politica sotto i regni di Odoacre e di Teodorico', *Atti del I Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani*, Rome, vol. I, 462–475.
- (1941). *Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Longobardi*, Storia di Roma 9, Bologna.
- Bindley T.H. and Green F.W., edd. (1950). *Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, London (4th edition).
- Binns, J. (1994). *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ*, Oxford.
- Bíró-Sey, K. (1976). 'Silver Medal of Anastasius in the Numismatic Collection of the Hungarian National Museum', *Folia Archaeologica* 27: 121–126.
- Blockley, R.C. (1981–1983). *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, Liverpool, 2 vols.
- (1985). 'Subsidies and Diplomacy: Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity', *Phoenix* 39: 62–74.
- (1992). *East Roman Foreign Policy: formation and conduct from Diocletian to Anastasius*, Leeds.
- Boak, A.E.R. (1919). 'Imperial coronation ceremonies of the fifth and sixth centuries', *HSCP* 30: 37–47.
- (1928). 'Byzantine Imperialism in Egypt', *American Historical Review* 34: 1–8.
- Brandes, W. (1997). 'Anastasios ó δίκτογ: Endzeiterwartung und kaiserkritik in Byzanz im 500 N. Chr.', *BZ* 90: 24–63.
- Brandes, W. and Haldon, J. (2000). 'Towns, Tax and Transformation: state, cities and their hinterlands in the East Roman World', in *Towns and their territories between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edd. G.P. Brogiolo, N. Gauthier and N. Christie, Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 141–172.
- Brands, G. (1995). 'Martyrion und Bischofskirche — Anmerkungen zur Architektur und Bauornamentik des Zentralbaus von Resafa', in *Akten des 12 Internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie*, Münster, 590–597.

- (1998). 'Die Entstehung einer Stadt — Beobachtungen zur Bauornamentik von Resafa', in *Spätantike und byzantinische Bauskulptur*, edd. U. Peschlow and S. Möllers, Stuttgart, 54–74.
- Braund, D.C. (1994). *Georgia in Antiquity*, Oxford.
- Bréhier, L. (1914). 'Anastase', *DHGE*, vol. II, cols. 1447–1457.
- (1949). *Le monde byzantin*, Paris, vol. II, 'Les institutions de l'empire byzantin'.
- Brezzi, P. (1936). 'Gelasio I e il nuovo orientamento politico della Chiesa di Roma', *Nuova Rivista Storica* 20: 321–346.
- Brightman, F.E. (1901). 'Byzantine Imperial Coronations', *JTS* 2: 359–392.
- Brion, M. (1935). *Theoderic roi des Ostrogoths, 454–526*, Paris.
- Brock, S. (1979/1980). 'Syriac Historical Writing: ■ survey of the main sources', *Journal of the Iraqi Academy (Syriac Corporation)* 5: 297–326, reprinted in *Studies in Syriac Christianity*, Aldershot 1992, no. I, 1–30.
- (1996). 'The 'Nestorian' Church: a lamentable misnomer', *Bulletin, John Rylands Library* 78.3: 23–35.
- Brock, S. and Harvey, S.A. (1987). *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Berkeley.
- Brooks, E.W. (1892). 'The date of the historian John Malala', *EHR* 7: 291–301.
- (1893). 'The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians', *EHR* 8: 209–238.
- Browning, R. (1971). *Justinian and Theodora*, London (revised 1987).
- Burgess, W.D. (1990). 'Isaurian names and the ethnic identity of the Isaurians in late antiquity', *Ancient World* 21: 109–121.
- (1992). 'Isaurian factions in the reign of Zeno the Isaurian', *Latomus* 51: 874–880.
- Burns, T.S. (1984). *A History of the Ostrogoths*, Bloomington.
- Burstein, Stanley M. (1992). 'An Elephant for Anastasius: ■ note on P. Mich. inv. 4290', *Ancient History Bulletin* 6.2: 55–57.
- Bury, J.B. (1911). *The imperial administration system in the ninth century*, London.
- (1923). *History of the Later Roman Empire*, London, 2 vols.
- Butler, H.C. (1920). *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909*, Division II, *Architecture, B = Northern Syria*, Leiden.
- (1969). *Early churches in Syria, fourth–seventh centuries*, Amsterdam.
- Calder, W.M. (1928–1962). *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, Manchester, 8 vols.
- Callu, J.P. (1974). 'Les téronces d'Anastase', *Bulletin de la société française de numismatique* 29, no. 4: 551.
- (1982). 'Le tarif d'Abydos et la reforme d'Anastase', *Actes du 9^e Congrès int. de numismatique (Berne 1979)*, Louvain–Luxemburg, 731–740.
- Cameron, Alan, (1973). *Porphyrius the Charioteer*, Oxford.
- (1974). 'The date of Priscian's *De Laude Anastasii*', *GRBS* 15: 313–316.

- (1976). *Circus Factions; Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford.
- (1978). 'The House of Anastasius', *GRBS* 19: 259–276.
- Cameron, Averil, (1967). 'Notes on the Sophiae, the Sophianae and the Harbour of Sophia', *Byzantion* 37: 11–20.
- (1985). *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London.
- (1993a). *The Later Roman Empire*, London.
- (1993b). *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, A.D. 395–600*, London.
- Capizzi, C. (1969). *L'imperatore Anastasio I*, Rome.
- (1978). 'Potere e ideologia Imperiale da Zenone a Giustiniano (474–527)', in *L'imperatore Giustiniano, storia e mito*, Giornate di Studio a Ravenna, 14–16 Oct. 1976, ed. G.G. Archi, Milan, 3–35.
- Carney, T.F. (1971). *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine bureaucracies viewed from within*, Kansas.
- Casey, R.P. (1926). 'Julian of Halicarnassus', *HTR* 19: 206–213.
- Caspar, Erich (1931). *Theoderich der Grosse und das Papsttum*, Berlin.
- (1933). *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, Tübingen, vol.II.
- Černousov, E. (1926). 'Études sur Malalas, époque d'Anastase Dicorus', *Byzantion* 3: 65–72.
- Cessi, R. (1919). 'Lo scisma laurenziano e le origini della dottrina politica della Chiesa di Roma', *ASRS* 42: 5–229.
- (1920). 'Dallo scisma laurenziano alla pacificazione religiosa con l'Oriente', *ASRS* 43: 209–321.
- Chadwick, H. (1981). *Boethius: the consolations of music, logic, theology and philosophy*, Oxford.
- Chapot, V. (1907). *La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquête arabe*, Paris.
- Charanis, P. (1973). 'On the Social Structure of the Later Roman Empire', *Byzantion* 17 (1944–1945) 39–57, reprinted in *Social, Economic and Political Life in the Byzantine Empire*, London, no.III.
- (1973). 'On the Social Structure and Economic Organisation of the Byzantine Empire in the thirteenth century and later', *Byzantinoslavica* 12 (1951) 94–153, reprinted in *Social, Economic and Political Life in the Byzantine Empire*, London, no.IV.
- (1962). Review of Karayannopulos (1958), *BZ* 55: 334–336.
- (1974). *Church and state in the Later Roman Empire. The religious policy of Anastasius I, 491–518*, Thessalonika (2nd edition).
- Chastagnol, A. (1966). *Le sénat romain sous le règne d'Odoacre*, Bonn.
- (1976). *La fin du monde antique: de Stilicon à Justinien*, Paris.
- Chauvot, A. (1977). 'Observations sur la date de l'Eloge d'Anastase de Priscien de Césarée', *Latomus* 36: 539–550.
- (1986). *Procopé de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégyriques de*

- l'empereur Anastase I^{er}*, Bonn.
- Chénon, E. (1889). 'Étude historique sur le Defensor Civitatis', *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 13: 321–362.
- Christensen, A. (1925). *Le règne du roi Kawād et le communisme Mazdakite*, Copenhagen.
- (1944). *L'Iran sous les Sasanides*, Copenhagen (2nd edition).
- Chrysos, E.K. (1971). 'Die angebliche Abschaffung der Städtischen kurien durch Kaiser Anastasios', *Byzantina* 3: 95–102.
- (1981). 'Die Amaler-Herrschaft in Italien und das Imperium Romanum: Der Vertragsentwurf des Jahres 535', *Byzantion* 51: 430–474.
- Claude, D. (1969). *Die byzantinische Stadt im 6. Jahrhundert*, Munich.
- (1980). 'Die ostgotischen Königserhebungen', in *Die Völker an der mittleren und unteren Donau im fünften und sechsten Jahrhundert*, edd. H. Wolfram and F. Daim, Vienna, 149–186.
- Clauss, M. (1984). 'Urbicius "praepositus imperii"', *Sodalitas: Scritti in onore di A. Guarino*, Naples, vol. 3, 1245–1257.
- Clinton, H.F. (1845). *Fasti Romani. The civil and literary chronology of Rome and Constantinople from the death of Augustus to the death of Justin II*, Oxford, vol.I.
- Coleman-Norton, P.R. (1966). *Roman State and Christian Church: a collection of legal documents to AD 535*, London, vol.3.
- Collinet, P. (1924). 'Une "ville neuve" byzantine en 507: la fondation de Dara (Anastasiopolis) en Mésopotamie', in *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger*, Paris, 55–60.
- Collot, C. (1965). 'La pratique de l'institution du Suffragium au Bas-Empire', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* ser. 4, 43: 185–221.
- Conybeare, F.C. (1902). 'The Relation of the Paschal Chronicle to Malalas', *BZ* 11: 395–405.
- Courcelle, P. (1948–1949). 'Le titre d'Auguste décerné à Clovis', *Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France*, 46–57.
- Coyne, P. (1991). *Priscian of Caesarea's De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris*, Lampeter.
- Croke, B. (1992). 'Justinian's Bulgar victory celebration', *Byzantinoslavica* 41 (1980) 188–195, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot, no.XIX.
- (1982a). 'Mundo the Gepid: from freebooter to Roman general', *Chiron* 12.125–135, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot, no.XVIII.
- (1982b). 'The Date of the "Anastasian Long Wall" in Thrace', *GRBS* 23.59–78, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot, no.XVII.
- (1992). 'AD 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point', *Chiron* 13 (1983), 81–119, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot, no.V.
- (1984). 'Marcellinus on Dara: a fragment of his lost *de temporum*

- qualitatibus et postionibus locorum*', *Phoenix* 38: 77–88.
- (1995). *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, Sydney.
- Croke, B. and Crow, J. (1983). 'Procopius and Dara', *JRS* 73: 143–159, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot 1992, no.XI.
- Croke, B. and Emmett, A.M. (1983). 'The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle', in *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, edd. B. Croke and A.M. Emmett, Sydney and Oxford, 116–131, reprinted in *Christian chronicles and Byzantine history, fifth to sixth centuries*, Aldershot 1992, no.III.
- Crone, P. (1991). 'Kawad's heresy and Mazdak's revolt', *Iran* 29: 21–42.
- Crow, J. (1993). 'The long walls of Thrace', in *Constantinople and its hinterland*, edd. C. Mango and G. Dagron, Aldershot, 109–124.
- (1997). 'Anastasian Wall Project 1996', *BBBS* 23: 34–38.
- (1999). 'Anastasian Wall Project 1997–98', *BBBS* 25: 32–35.
- Crow, J. and Bayliss, R. (2001). 'The Anastasian Wall and the water supply of Constantinople Survey 2000', *BBBS* 27: 41–45.
- Crow J. and Ricci, A. (1997). 'Investigating the hinterland of Constantinople: interim report on the Anastasian Long Wall', *JRA* 10: 235–262.
- Crowfoot, J.W. (1941). *Early churches in Palestine*, London.
- Dagron, G. (1985). 'Un tarif des sportules à payer aux *curiosi* du port de Séleucie de piérie' in G. Dagron and D. Feissel, 'Inscriptions inédites du Musée d'Antioche', *TM* 9: 421–461.
- Dain, A. (1967). 'Les stratégestes byzantins', *TM* 2: 315–390.
- Daley, B.E. (1995). 'Apollo as a Chalcedonian: a new fragment of a controversial work from early sixth-century Constantinople', *Traditio* 50: 31–49.
- Danstrup, J. (1946). 'Indirect Taxation at Byzantium', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 8: 139–162.
- (1946). 'The State and Landed Property in Byzantium to c.1250', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 8: 222–262.
- Dawes, E. and Baynes, N.H. (1948). *Three Byzantine Saints; contemporary biographies*, Oxford.
- Delmaire, R. (1989). *Largesses sacrées et res privata*, Rome.
- Devréesse, R. (1942). 'Arabes-Perses et Arabes-Romains: Lakhmides et Ghassanides', *Vivre et Penser* 2: 263–307.
- (1945). *Le patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris.
- Diekamp, F. (1903). 'Zu Theodoros Lektor', *HJG* 24: 553–558.
- Dillemann, L. (1962). *Haute Mésopotamie orientale et pays adjacents*, Paris.
- Dittenberger, W. (1905). *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Leipzig, vol. II.
- Djoadze, W. (1986). *Archaeological investigations in the region west of Antioch-on-the-Orontes*, Stuttgart.
- Downey, G. (1938). 'Imperial building records in Malalas', *BZ* 38: 1–5, 299–

- 311.
- (1961). *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton.
- Duchesne, L. (1892). 'L'Illyricum ecclésiastique', *BZ* 1: 531–550.
- (1896). 'Les missions chrétiennes au sud de l'empire romain', *MAH* 16: 79–122.
- (1925). *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle*, Paris.
- Durlat J. and Guillou, A. (1984). 'Le tarif d'Abydos', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 108: 581–598.
- Duval, R. (1891). 'Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Édesse', *Journal Asiatique* ser. 8, no.18: 87–133, 201–278, 381–439.
- (1892). 'Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Édesse', *Journal Asiatique* ser. 8, no.19: 5–102.
- (1900). *La littérature syriaque*, Paris.
- Dvorník, F. (1946). 'The Circus Parties in Byzantium: their evolution and their suppression', *Byzantina Metabyzantina* I, part 1, 119–133.
- (1951). 'Pope Gelasius and the Emperor Anastasius I', *BZ* 44: 111–116.
- (1958). *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- (1959). *The Slavs: their early history and civilisation*, Boston.
- (1966). *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: origins and background*, Washington.
- Elton, H. (2000). 'The nature of the sixth-century Isaurians', in *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*, edd. S. Mitchell and G. Greatrex, Swansea, 293–307.
- Endlicher, S.L. (1828). *Prisciani Grammatici de Laude Imperatoris Anastasii, et de Ponderibus et Mensuris Carmina*, Vienna.
- Ensslin, W. (1927). 'Zur Gründungsgeschichte von Dara-Anastasiopolis', *Byzantinisch neugriechische Jahrbücher* 5: 342–347.
- (1936). 'Nochmals zu der Ehrung Chlodowechs durch kaiser Anastasius', *HJG* 56: 499–507.
- (1947). *Theoderich der Grosse*, Munich.
- (1961). 'Vitalian', *PW*, ser. 2, vol.XVII, cols.374–378.
- Evans, J.A.S. (1996). 'The monophysite persecution: the eastern view', *Ancient World* 27.2: 191–196.
- Ficarra, R. (1978). 'Motivi ed orientamenti cristiani nel De Laude Anastasii di Prisciano', in *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, ed., E. Livrea and G.A. Privitera, Rome, vol.I, 357–371.
- Foerster, G. and Tsafir Y. (1992). 'The Bet Shean Excavation Project (1989–1991): City Centre (north)', *ESI* 11.
- Fowden, E.K. (1999). *The Barbarian Plain: St. Sergius between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Frend, W.H.C. (1972). *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge.
- (1979). 'The fall of Macedonius in 511 — a suggestion', in *Kerygma und Logos — Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen*

- Antike und Christentum: festschrift für Carl Andresen*, ed. A.M. Ritter, Göttingen, 183–195.
- (1981). 'Isauria, Severus of Antioch's problem-child, 512–518', *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, ed. F. Paschke, Berlin, 209–216.
- Gabotto, F. (1911). *Storia della Italia occidentale nel medio evo (393–1313)*, Pinerolo.
- Gatier, P.-L. and Ulbert, Th. (1991). 'Eine Türsturzinschrift aus Resafa-Sergiopolis', *Damaszener Mitteilungen* 5: 169–182.
- Gaudenzi, A. (1888). *Sui rapporti tra l'Italia e l'impero d'Oriente*, Bologna.
- Geanakoplos, Deno J. (1966). 'Church Building and 'Caesaropapism' A.D. 312–565', *GRBS* 7: 167–186.
- Geiss, H. (1931). 'Geld- und naturalwirtschaftliche Erscheinungsformen im staatlichen Aufbau Italiens während der Gotenzeit', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 27.
- Geizer, H. (1892). 'Josua Stylites und die damaligen kirchlichen Parteien des Ostens', *BZ* 1: 34–49.
- Gibbon, Edward (1989). *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J.B. Bury, London, vol. IV.
- Goffart, W. (1988). *The Narrators of Barbarian History, A.D. 500–800*, Princeton.
- Goossens, G. (1943). *Hiérapolis de Syrie*, Louvain.
- Gordon, C.D. (1949). 'Subsidies in Roman imperial defence', *Phoenix* 3: 60–69.
- (1959). 'Procopius and Justinian's financial policies', *Phoenix* 13: 23–30.
- Gray, E.W. (1973). 'The Roman Eastern Limes from Constantine to Justinian — perspectives and problems', *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 12: 24–40.
- Gray, P.T. (1979). *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden.
- Greatrex, G. (1993). 'The two fifth-century wars between Rome and Persia', *Florilegium* 12: 1–14.
- (1994). *Procopius and the Persian Wars*, D.Phil., Oxford.
- (1996). 'Flavius Hypatius, quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum. An Investigation of his career', *Byzantion* 66: 20–142.
- (1997). 'The Nika Riot: a reappraisal', *JHS* 117: 60–86.
- (1998). *Rome and Persia at War, 502–532*, Leeds.
- Greatrex, G. and Watt, J. (1999). 'One, Two or Three Feasts? The Brytae, the Maiuma and the May Festival at Edessa', *OC* 83: 1–21.
- Greatrex, G. and Lieu, Samuel N.C., edd. (2002). *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars, Part III, AD 363–630*, London and New York.
- Green, J. and Tsafir, Y. (1982). 'Greek Inscriptions from Hammat Gader', *IEJ* 32: 94–95.
- Greenhalgh, P.A.L. (1980). *Pompey, the Roman Alexander*, London.
- Grégoire, H. (1922). *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineur*, Paris.
- Gregory, S. (1997). *Roman Military Architecture on the Eastern Frontier*,

- Amsterdam.
- Grierson, P. (1959). 'The *Tablettes Albertini* and the value of the *solidus* in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D.', *JRS* 49: 73–80.
- (1962). 'The tombs and obits of the Byzantine emperors (337–1042)', *DOP* 16: 1–60.
- (1967). 'The monetary reforms of Anastasius and their economic consequences', in *Patterns of Monetary Development in Phoenicia and Palestine in Antiquity*, ed. A. Kindler, Tel Aviv, 283–302.
- (1982). *Byzantine coins*, London.
- Grillmeier, A. (1987). *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London and Oxford, vol. II, part 1, tr. P. Allen and J. Cawte.
- Grillmeier, A. and Hainthaler, T. (1996). *Christ in Christian Tradition*, London, vol. II, part 4.
- Grisar, H. (1912). *History of Rome and the Popes in the Middle Ages*, tr. L. Cappadelta, London, vol. II.
- Grousset, R. (1947). *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*, Paris.
- Grumel, V. (1932). *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, Constantinople.
- Guilland, R. (1966) (1967). 'Études sur l'hippodrome de Byzance', *Byzantinoslavica* 27 (1966) 289–307; 28 (1967) 262–277.
- (1967). *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, Berlin and Amsterdam, 2 vols.
- Gunther, O. (1895–1898). *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, Vienna.
- Gutteridge, A. (2003). 'Cultural Geographies and 'the ambition of Latin Europe': the city of Durres and its fortifications c.400 – c.1501', *Archaeologia Medievale* 30: 19–65.
- Gutteridge, A., Hoti, A. and Hurst, H.R. (2001). 'The walled town of Dyrrachium (Durres): settlement and dynamics', *JRA* 14: 388–410.
- Haacke, W. (1939). 'Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma', *Analecta Gregoriana* 20: 1–150.
- Haarer, F.K. (2004). Review of Laniado (2002), *JRA* 17: 735–740.
- Hahn, W. (1981). *Moneta Imperii Byzantini*, Vienna, vol. 3.
- Hahn, W., with Metlich, M.A. (2000). *Money of the Incipient Byzantine Empire*, Vienna.
- Haldon, J.F. (1990). *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: the transformation of a culture*, Cambridge.
- Haldon J.F. and Byrne, M. (1977). 'A Possible Solution to the Problem of Greek Fire', *BZ* 70: 91–99.
- Halleux, A. de, (1963). *Philoxène de Mabbog: sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain.
- Hardy, E.R. (1931). *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, New York.
- Harl, K.W. (1996). *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300BC to AD 700*,

- Baltimore and London.
- Harmatta, J. (1974). 'The struggle for the possession of South Arabia between Aksum and the Sassanians', in *IV Congresso Internazionale di Studi Etiopici*, Rome, 95–106.
- Harnack, A. (1898). *History of Dogma*, tr. E.B. Speirs and J. Millar, London, vol.IV (tr. from the 3rd edition).
- Harrison, M. (1984). Review of Karnapp (1976), *CR* 34: 105–106.
- Harrison, R.M. (1969). 'The Long Wall in Thrace', *Archaeologia Aeliana* ser. 4, 47: 33–38.
- Hartmann, L.M. (1897). *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter*, Leipzig, vol.I.
- Hawkins, Ernest J.W. and Mundell, Marlia C. (1973). 'The Mosaics of the Monastery of Mār Samuel, Mār Simeon, and Mār Gabriel near Kartmin', *DOP* 27: 279–296.
- Heather, P. (1991). *Goths and Romans 332–489*, Oxford.
- Hefele, Carl, J. (1895). *History of the Councils of the Church from the original documents*, tr. W.R. Clark, Edinburgh, vol.IV.
- Helm, R. (1954). 'Priscianus', *PW*, vol.XXII.2, cols.2328–2346.
- Hendy, M. (1985). *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c.300–1450*, Cambridge.
- (1989). *The Economy, Fiscal Administration and Coinage of Byzantium*, Aldershot.
- Hill, Stephen (1996). *The Early Byzantine Churches of Cilicia and Isauria*, Aldershot.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1905). *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, Berlin.
- Hirschfeld, Y. (1992). *The Judaean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period*, Yale.
- His, R. (1896). *Die Domänen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig.
- Hoddinott, R.F. (1975). *Bulgaria in Antiquity*, London and Tunbridge.
- Hodgkin, T. (1885). *Italy and her Invaders*, Oxford, vol.III, 'The Ostrogothic Invasion'.
- (1891). *Theoderic the Goth, the barbarian champion of civilisation*, New York and London.
- Hoeflich, M.H. (1975). 'Gelasius I and Roman Law: one further word', *JTS* 26: 114–119.
- Hohlfelder, R.L. (1985). 'Byzantine coin finds from the sea: a glimpse of Caesarea Maritima's later history', in *Harbour Archaeology. Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop of Ancient Mediterranean Harbours; Caesarea Maritima*, ed. A. Raban, *BAR* 257, Oxford, 179–183.
- (1988). 'Procopius, *de Aedificiis* I.ii.18–20: Caesarea Maritima and the building of harbours in late antiquity', in *Medieval Cities: historical perspectives*, edd. I. Malkin and R.L. Hohlfelder, London.
- Holmes, William G. (1905). *The age of Justinian and Theodora*, London (2nd edition 1912), vol.I.

- (1977). 'Pulcheria's Castle and the ideology of imperial victory', *GRBS* 18: 153–172.
- (1992). 'The Temple Platform; progress report on the excavations', in *Caesarea Papers 2: Herod's Temple, the provincial governor's praetorium and granaries, the later harbor, a gold coin hoard, and other studies*, ed. K.G. Holum, A. Raban and J. Patrick, *JRA* supplementary series no.5, vol. II, 12–34.
- Holum, K. et al. (1992). 'Preliminary report on the 1989–1990 season', in *Caesarea Papers: Straton's Tower, Herod's Harbour, and Roman and Byzantine Caesarea*, ed. R.L. Vann, *JRA* supplementary series no.5, vol. I, 79–111.
- Honigsmann, E. (1952). 'Zacharias of Mytilene', *Patristic Studies, Studi e Testi* 173, XXI, 194–204.
- (1951). *Evêques et Evêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO, subsidia 2.
- Hopwood, Keith, (1983). 'Policing the Hinterland: Rough Cilicia and Isauria', in *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia*, ed. S. Mitchell, *BAR* 156, Oxford, 173–188.
- Howard-Johnston, J.D. (1989). 'Procopius, Roman Defences North of the Taurus and the New Fortress at Citharizon', in *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*, edd. D.H. French and C.S. Lightfoot, *BAR* 553, Oxford, part 1, 203–229.
- (1995). 'The Two Great Powers in Late Antiquity: ■ comparison', *Studies in Late Antique and Early Islam. The Byzantine and Islamic Near East: III, States, Resources and Armies*, ed. Averil Cameron, Princeton.
- Howarth, H. (1892). 'The Sabiri and the Saroguri', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 24: 613–636.
- Illuk, J. (1985). 'The export of gold from the Roman Empire to barbarian countries from the 4th to the 6th centuries', *Münstersche Beiträge z. antiken Handelsgeschichte* IV.1: 79–102.
- Isaac, B. (1992). *The Limits of Empire*, Oxford (revised).
- Jaffé, P. (1885–1888). *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, Leipzig.
- James, Edward (1988). *The Franks*, Oxford.
- Janin, R. (1963a). 'Elias', *DHGE*, vol.XV, cols.189–190.
- (1963b). 'Euphémios', *DHGE*, vol.XV, cols.1410–1411.
- (1964). *Constantinople byzantine*, Paris (2nd edition).
- (1969). *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, vol.I.3, 'Les églises et les monastères', Paris (2nd edition).
- Jarry, J. (1960). 'Hérésies et factions à Constantinople du Ve au VIIe siècle', *Syria* 37: 348–471.
- (1966). 'Une prétendue invasion perse en Egypte sous Anastase', *Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale* 64: 197–201.
- (1968). *Hérésies et factions dans l'empire byzantin*, Le Caire.
- Jeffreys, E. with Croke, B. and Scott, R. (1990). *Studies in John Malalas*, Sydney.

- Jeffreys, E., Jeffreys, M. and Scott, R. (1986). *John Malalas, the Chronicle*, Melbourne.
- Johnson A.C. and West, L.C. (1967). *Byzantine Egypt: economic studies*, Amsterdam.
- Jones, A.H.M. (1953). 'Inflation under the Roman Empire', *The Economic History Review*, ser.2, vol.5, no.3: 293–318.
- (1959). 'Were ancient heresies national or social movements in disguise?', *JTS* n.s.10: 280–298.
- (1960). 'Church finance in the fifth and sixth centuries', *JTS*, n.s.11: 84–94.
- (1962). 'The Constitutional Position of Odoacer and Theoderic', *JRS* 52: 126–130.
- (1964). *The Later Roman Empire 284–602*, Oxford, 3 vols.
- (1966). *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford, 2nd edition.
- (1974). *The Roman Economy*, ed. P. Brunt, Oxford.
- Kaegi, W.E. (1981). *Byzantine Military Unrest, 471–843: an interpretation*, Amsterdam.
- Kantorowicz, E. (1960). 'On the Golden Marriage Belt and the Marriage Rings of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection', *DOP* 14: 3–16.
- Kaplan, M. (1992). *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance, du VI^e au XI^e siècle*, Paris.
- Karayannopulos, J. (1956) 'Die Chrysoteleia der iuga', *BZ* 49: 72–84.
- (1958). *Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates*, Munich.
- Karlowa, O. (1885). *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, Leipzig, vol.I.
- Karnapp, W. (1976). *Die Stadtmauer von Resafa in Syrien*, Berlin.
- Kawar, I. (1955). 'Arethas, Son of Jabalah', *JAOS* 75: 205–216.
- (1958a). 'Ghassan and Byzantium: a new terminus a quo', *Der Islam* 33: 232–255.
- (1958b). 'The Last Days of Salih', *Arabica* 5: 145–158.
- (1960). 'Byzantium and Kinda', *BZ* 53: 57–73.
- Kazhdan, A.P. (1985). 'George the Monk', in *DMA*, vol.V, 401–402.
- (1989). 'John Zonaras', in *DMA*, vol.XII, 745–746.
- Kempen, C. (1918). *Procopii Gazaei in imperatorem Anastasium panegyricus*, Diss., Bonn.
- Kent, J.P.C. (1956). 'Gold coinage in the Later Roman Empire', in *Essays in Roman coinage presented to Harold Mattingly*, edd. R.A.G. Carson and C.H.V. Sutherland, Oxford, 190–204.
- (1971). 'The coinage of Theoderic in the names of Anastasius and Justin I', in *Mints, dies and currency. Essays in memory of Albert Baldwin*, ed. R.A.G. Carson, London, chapter VI, 67–74.
- Kingsley, S. (1999). *Specialised production and long distance trade in Byzantine Palestine*, D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 2 vols.
- Kraemer, C.J. (1958). *Excavations at Nessana*, Princeton, vol. III.
- Kugener, M. (1900). 'La Compilation historique de Pseudo-Zacharie le

- rhéteur', *ROC* 5: 201–214, 461–480.
- (1907). 'Extraits, Notices et Poésies sur Sévère', *PO* 2: 265–400.
- Labourt, J. (1904). *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224–632)*, Paris.
- Laet, S.J. de, (1949). *Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains, surtout à l'époque du Haut-Empire*, Brugge.
- Lamma, P. (1968). 'La politica dell'imperatore Anastasio I', *Rivista Storica Italiana* ser. 5, vol.VI (1939–1940) 27–57, reprinted in *Oriente e Occidente nell'alto medioevo*, Padua.
- (1968). 'Teoderico nella storiografia Bizantina', *Oriente e Occidente nell'alto medioevo*, Padua, 187–195.
- Lane Fox, Robin, (1997). 'The Life of Daniel', in *Portraits: biographical representations in the Greek and Latin literature of the Roman Empire*, edd. M.J. Edwards and S. Swain, Oxford, 175–225.
- Laniado, A. (1991). 'Some problems in the sources for the reign of the emperor Zeno', *BMGS* 15: 147–173.
- (2002). *Recherches sur les notables municipaux dans l'empire protobyzantin*, Paris.
- Lauffray, J. (1983). *Halabiyya–Zenobia, place forte du Limes oriental et la Haute-Mésopotamie au VI^e siècle*, Paris, vol. I.
- Lebon, Joseph (1909). *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain.
- (1929). 'Les citations patristiques dans le Sceau de la Foi', *RHE* 25: 5–32.
- (1951). 'La christologie du monophysisme syrien', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, edd. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg, vol.I, 425–580.
- Leclainche, H. (1980). 'Crises économiques à Edesse (494–506) d'après la chronique du pseudo-Josué le Stylite', *Pallas* 27: 89–100.
- Lécrivain, C. (1903). 'L'origine de l'impôt dit *lustralis collatio* ou *chrysargyre*', in *Mélanges Boissier*, Paris, 331–334.
- Lee, A.D. (1991). 'The Role of Hostages in Roman Diplomacy with Sassanian Persia', *Historia* 40: 366–374.
- (1993). *Information and Frontiers. Roman foreign relations in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Lemerle, P. (1954). 'Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans', *RH* 211: 265–308.
- (1964). Review of Antoniadis-Bibicou (1963), *RH* 232: 225–231.
- (1971). *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à byzance des origines au X^e siècle*, Paris.
- (1979). *The Agrarian History of Byzantium. From the origins to the twelfth century*, Galway.
- Lenski, N. (1999). 'Assimilation and revolt in the territory of Isauria from the 1st century BC to the 6th century AD', *JESHO* 42: 413–465.
- Letsios, D.G. (1989). 'The case of Amorkesos and the question of the Roman *foederati* in Arabia in the Vth century', in *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel*, ed. T. Fahd, Leiden, 525–538.

- Levillain, L. (1933). 'La crise des années 507–508 et les rivalités d'influence en Gaule', in *Mélanges N. Iorga*, Paris, 537–567.
- Lewis, A.R. (1951). *Naval power and trade in the Mediterranean AD 500–1000*, Princeton.
- Liebeschuetz, W. (1973). 'The Origin of the Office of the Pagarch', *BZ* 66: 38–46.
- (1977). 'The Defences of Syria in the sixth century', *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms*, ed. C.B. Rüger, Cologne and Bonn, chapter II, 487–499.
- (1997). 'The rise of the bishop in the Christian Roman Empire and the successor kingdoms', *Electrum, Studies in Ancient History* 1, ed. E. Dąbrowa, Cracow, 113–125.
- (1998). 'The Circus Factions', *Convegno per Santa Mazzarino, Roma 9–11 maggio 1991*, Rome, 163–185.
- (2001). *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford.
- Lindsay, J. (1952). *Byzantium into Europe*, London.
- Lingenthal, K.E. Zachariae von (1879). 'Zum "Edikt Justinians"', *Mittheilungen des deutschen Archäologischen Institutes in Athen* 4: 312–315.
- Littman, E., Magie D. and Stuart D.R., edd. (1921). *Syria, Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909*, Division III, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, A = Southern Syria, Leiden 1921.
- Longuet, H. (1943). 'Follis posthume d'Anastase d'Antioche', *Revue Numismatique*, ser.5, no.7, v–vi.
- Lot, F. (1939). *Les invasions germaniques*, Paris.
- (1955). *Nouvelles recherches sur l'impôt foncier et la capitation personnelle sous le Bas-Empire*, Paris.
- (1966). *The End of the Ancient World and the Beginning of the Middle Ages*, tr. P. and M. Leon, London (reprinted).
- Luther, A. (1997). *Die syrische Chronik des Josua Stylites*, Berlin.
- Maas, M. (1992). *John Lydus and the Roman Past: antiquarianism and politics in the age of Justinian*, London.
- McCormick, M. (1986). *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge.
- MacCormack, S. (1972). 'Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: the ceremony of *Adventus*', *Historia* 21: 721–752.
- (1974). *Adventus and Consecratio. Studies in Roman Imperial art and panegyric from the late 3rd to the 6th century*, D. Phil., Oxford.
- MacMullen, R. (1976). 'Two Notes on Imperial Properties', *Athenaeum* n.s. 54: 19–36.
- MacPherson, R. (1989). *Rome in Involution: Cassiodorus' Variae in their literary and historical setting*, Poznań.
- Magie, David, (1950). *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton, 2 vols.
- Mango, C. (1959). *The Brazen House*, Copenhagen.
- (1963). 'Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder', *DOP* 17: 55–75.
- (1966). 'Isaurian builders', in *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth, Heidelberg, 358–365.
- (1978). 'Who Wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?', *Zbornik radova Vizantoloskog instituta* 18: 9–17.
- (1985). *Le développement urbain de Constantinople IV^e – VII^e siècles*, Paris.
- (1990). *Nicephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople, Short History*, Washington.
- (1995). 'The Water Supply of Constantinople', in *Constantinople and its Hinterland*, edd. C. Mango and G. Dagron, Aldershot, 9–18.
- Mango, C. and Scott, R. (1997). *The Chronography of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A.D. 284–813*, Oxford.
- Mango, C., and Ševčenko, I. (1972). 'Three inscriptions of the reign of Anastasius and Constantine V', *BZ* 65: 379–393.
- Mango, M.M. (1993). 'The purpose and places of Byzantine silver stamping', in *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, edd. M.M. Mango and S.A. Boyd, Washington, 203–216.
- Manojlović, G. (1936). 'Le peuple de Constantinople', tr. H. Grégoire, *Byzantion* 11: 617–716.
- Mansi, Giovanni D. (1762). *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Florence, vol. VIII.
- Martin, T.O. (1953). 'The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Geschichte und Gegenwart*, edd. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg, vol. II, 433–458.
- Maspero, J. (1912). *Organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine*, Paris.
- (1923). *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie*, Paris.
- Mathisen, W. (1986). 'Patricians as Diplomats in Late Antiquity', *BZ* 79: 35–49.
- Mayerson, P. (1986). 'The Saracens and the limes', *BASOR* 262: 35–47.
- (1992). 'The island of Iotabê in the Byzantine sources: a reprise', *BASOR* 287: 1–4.
- (1994). *Monks, Martyrs, Soldiers and Saracens*, Jerusalem.
- (1995). 'A note on Iotabe and several other islands in the Red Sea', *BASOR* 298: 33–35.
- (1996). 'The port of Clysmā (Suez) in transition from Roman to Arab rule', *JNES* 55: 119–126.
- Merten, E. (1906). 'De bello Persico ab Anastasio gesto', *Commentationes Philologiae Ienenses* VII.2, Leipzig, 139–201.
- Metcalf, D.M. (1961). 'Organisation of the Constantinople Mint for the Follis of the Anastasian Reforms', *The Numismatic Chronicle*, ser.7, vol.I, 131–143.
- (1969). *The Origins of the Anastasian Currency Reform*, Amsterdam.
- Meyendorff, J. (1989). *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: the church AD*

- 450–680, New York.
- Mierow, C.C. (1966). *The Gothic History of Jordanes in English version*, Cambridge and New York.
- Migliardi Zingale, L. (1994). 'L'editto di Beersheba', in *Nuovi testi epigrafici e altri addenda et Corrigenda ai Subsidia I–III. Legum Iustiniani Imperatoris Vocabularium, a cura di M. Amelotti*, subsidia IV, Turin, 201–209.
- Miller, E. (1873). 'Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Egée', *Revue Archéologique* 26: 273–288.
- Millingen, A. van, (1899). *Byzantine Constantinople: the walls of the city and adjoining historical sites*, London.
- Mingana, A. (1925). 'The early spread of Christianity in central Asia and the Far East: a new document', *Bulletin, John Rylands Library* 9: 297–371.
- Minor, C.E. (1979). 'The Robber tribes of Isauria', *Ancient World* 11: 118–127.
- Mirbt, Karl (1924). *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*, Tübingen (4th edition).
- Mitford, T. B. (1980). 'Roman Rough Cilicia', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Principat* 7.2, Berlin and New York, 1230–1261.
- Möberg, A. (1924). *The Book of the Himyarites. Fragments of a hitherto unknown Syriac work*, Lund.
- Moeller, C. (1944). 'Nephalius d'Alexandrie', *RHE* 40: 73–140.
- (1951). 'Le chalcédonisme et le neo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, edd. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg, vol.I, 637–720.
- (1961). 'Un fragment du Type de l'empereur Anastase I', *Studia Patristica* 3, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 78, Berlin, 240–247.
- Momigliano, A. (1960). 'Gli Anicii ■ la storiografia latina del VI sec. D.C.', in *Secondo contributo alla Storia degli studi classici*, Rome (2nd edition 1984), 231–253.
- (1970). 'John Lydus', *OCD*, Oxford (2nd edition), 630.
- Mommsen, Th. (1872). 'Bruchstücke des Johannes von Antiochia und des Johannes Malalas', *Hermes* 6: 323–383.
- (1910). 'Ostgotische Studien', *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol.VI, no.X, 362–484, (= *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 14 (1889) 225–249, 453–544, and 15 (1890) 181–186).
- Monks, G.R. (1957). 'The Administration of the Privy Purse', *Speculum* 32: 748–779.
- Moorhead, J. (1992). *Theoderic in Italy*, Oxford.
- Mordtmann, A. (1879). 'Ein Edict Justinians', *Mittheilungen des deutschen Archäologischen Institutes in Athen* 4: 307–311.
- Morrisson, C. (1989). 'Monnaie et prix à Byzance du Ve au VIIe siècle', in *Hommes et richesses dans l'empire byzantin I, IV^e–VI^e siècle*, edd. J. Lefort and C. Morisson, Paris.
- Mühlberger, S. (1990). *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers. Prosper, Hydatius, and the Gallic Chronicler of 452*, Arca 27, Leeds.

- Mundell, Marlia C. (1975). 'A sixth century funerary relief at Dara in Mesopotamia', *JÖB* 24: 209–227.
- Musset, L. (1975). *The Germanic Invasions; the making of Europe, 400–600 A.D.*, London (2nd edition).
- Nau, F. (1897). 'Analyse de la seconde partie inédite de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Jean d'Asie', *ROC* 2: 455–493.
- Nicks, F.K. (1998). *The reign of Anastasius I, 491–518*, D.Phil., Oxford.
- (2000). 'Literary Culture in the Reign of Anastasius', in *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*, edd. S. Mitchell and G. Greatrex, Swansea, 183–203.
- Niederle, L. (1923). *Manuel de l'antiquité Slave*, Paris, vol. I.
- Noble, T.F.X. (1985). 'A new look at the *Liber Pontificalis*', *Archivum Historiae Pontificae* 23: 347–358.
- Nöldeke, Th. (1904). 'Die Aufhebung des Chrysargyrum durch Anastasius', *BZ* 13: 135.
- Oehler, J. (1894). 'Anastasios', *PW*, vol.I, cols.2065–2067.
- Oikonomides, N. (1986). 'Silk trade and production in Byzantium from the sixth to the ninth century: the seals of kommerkiarioi', *DOP* 40: 33–53.
- Oleson, J.P. et al. (1994). *The Harbours of Caesarea Maritima*, vol. II, *The Finds and Ship*, BAR 594, Oxford.
- Olinder, G., (1927). *The Kings of Kinda of the Family of Ākil al-Murār*, Lund.
- Oliverio, G. (1936). *Il Decreto di Anastasio I su l'Ordinamento politico-militare della Cirenaica*, Bergamo.
- Ostrogorsky, G. (1956). *History of the Byzantine State*, tr. J. Hussey, Oxford.
- Palmer, A. (1990a). *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier*, Cambridge.
- (1990b). 'Who Wrote the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite?', *Ägypten und Altes Testament (Lingua restituta Orientalis — Festgabe für Julius Assfalg)*, edd. R. Schutz and M. Görg, vol.XX, 272–284.
- Palmer, A. with Brock S.P. and Hoyland R., tr. and annot. (1993). *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, Liverpool.
- Papadopoulos, J.B. (1928). *Les palais et les églises des Blachernes*, Athens.
- Parker, S.T. (1980). 'Towards a history of the *Limes Arabicus*', in *Roman Frontier Studies. Papers presented to the 12th international congress of Roman frontier studies*, ed. W.S. Hanson and L.J.F. Keppie, BAR 71, Oxford.
- (1986a). 'Retrospective on the Arabian Frontier after a Decade of Research', in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, edd. P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, BAR 297, Oxford, vol.II, 633–660.
- (1986b). *Romans and Saracens: a history of the Arabian frontier*, Winona Lake.
- Partington, J.R. (1960). *A History of Greek Fire and Gunpowder*, Cambridge.
- Parvan, V. (1915–1916). 'Histria – IV Inscriptii Găsite in 1914 și 1915', *Memoires de la section historique de l'Académie Roumaine* 38, Bucharest.
- (1925). 'Fouilles d'Histria', *Dacia* 2: 198–248.

- Peeters, P. (1948). 'Jacques de Saroug — appartient-il à la secte Monophysite?', *AB* 66: 134–198.
- (1950). 'Hypatius et Vitalien. Autour de la succession de l'empereur Anastase', *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 10: 5–51.
- Peters, F.E. (1977–1978). 'Byzantium and the Arabs of Spain', *Les annales archéologiques arabes syriennes* 27–28: 97–113.
- Petre, A. (1963). 'Quelques données archéologiques concernant la continuité de la population et de la culture romano-byzantines dans la Scythie Mineure aux VI^e et VII^e siècles de notre ère', *Dacia* 7: 317–353.
- Pétridès, S. (1914). 'Anastasiopolis', in *DHGE*, vol.II, cols.1489–1491.
- Pfeilschifter, G. (1896). 'Der ostgotenkönig Theoderich der Grosse und die katholische Kirche', in *Kirchengeschichte Studien*, Münster, vol.III.
- Picotti, G.B. (1956). 'Osservazioni su alcuni punti della politica religiosa di Teodorico', in *I Goti in Occidente Problemi*, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo, Settimane di Studio, 3, Spoleto, 173–226.
- Pietri, Ch. (1966). 'Le sénat, le peuple chrétien et les partis du cirque à Rome sous le pape Symmaque (498–514)', *MAH* 78: 123–129.
- Piganiol, A. (1967). *La conquête romaine*, Paris (5th edition).
- Pigulevskaja, N. (1967). 'Theophanes' Chronographia and the Syrian Chronicles', *JÖBG* 16: 55–60.
- Potts, D.T. (1990). *The Arabian Gulf in Antiquity*, Oxford, vol.II, 'From Alexander the Great to the coming of Islam'.
- Prentice, W.K. (1908). *Publications of An Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899–1900*, Part III, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, New York.
- (1922). *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909*, Division III, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, B = Northern Syria, Leiden.
- Price, R.M. (1985). *A History of the Monks of Syria*, Kalamazoo.
- Prostko-Prostyński, J. (1994). *Utraque Res Publicae. The Emperor Anastasius I's Gothic Policy (491–518)*, Poznań.
- Quien, M. le (1740). *Oriens Christianus, in quattuor patriarchatus digestus*, Paris, 3 vols.
- Raban, A. (1991). 'The subsidence of Sebastos', *Thracia Pontica* 4: 339–366.
- (1998). 'Combined Caesarea Excavations (B)', *ESI* 17: 58–76.
- Raban, A. and Holum, K.C., edd. (1996). *Caesarea Maritima. A retrospective after two millennia*, Leiden, New York, Cologne.
- Reinach, T. (1895). 'Inscriptions d'Amasie et autres lieux', *Revue des études grecque* 8: 77–87.
- Rémondon, R. (1964). *La crise de l'Empire romain*, Paris.
- Richards, Jeffrey M. (1979). *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752*, London.
- Robin, M.C. (1996). 'Le royaume Hujride, dit 'royaume de Kinda' entre Himyar et Byzance', *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 665–714.

- Rompay, van L. (1995). 'Impetuous martyrs? The situation of the Persian Christians in the last years of Yazdgard I (419–420)', in *Martyrium in multidisciplinary perspective: memorial Louis Reekmans*, edd. M. Lamberigts and P. van Deun, Louvain, 363–375.
- Rose, G.A. (1888). *Die byzantinische Kirchenpolitik unter Kaiser Anastasius I*, Wohlauf.
- Rothstein, G. (1899). *Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al-Hira — ein Versuch zur arabisch zur arabisch-persischen Geschichte zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, Berlin.
- Roueché, C. (1979). 'A new inscription from Aphrodisias and the title πατήρ τῆς πόλεως', *GRBS* 20: 173–185.
- Rougé, J. (1966). 'L'histoire Auguste et l'Isaurie au IV^e siècle', *Revue des études anciennes* 68: 282–315.
- Rouillard, G. (1928). *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*, Paris.
- Rubin, B. (1960). *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, Berlin, vol.I.
- Rubin, Z. (1986a). 'The Mediterranean and the Dilemma of the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 1: 3–62.
- (1986b). 'Diplomacy and War in the Relations between Byzantium and the Sassanids in the fifth Century', in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, edd. P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, *BAR* 297, Oxford, vol.II, 677–695.
- (1989). 'Byzantium and Southern Arabia: the policy of Anastasius', in *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*, edd. D.H. French and C.S. Lightfoot, *BAR* 553, Oxford, vol.II, 383–420.
- Salaville, S. (1920). 'L'affaire de l'Henotique', *Echos d'Orient* 19: 49–68.
- Sartre, M. (1982a). *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Paris.
- (1982b). *Trois études sur l'Arabie romaine et byzantine*, Brussels.
- (1985). *Bostra — des origines à l'Islam*, Paris.
- Schnurer, G. (1888) (1889). 'Die politische Stellung des Papsttums zur Zeit Theoderichs der Grossen', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 9 (1888) part 2, 251–283 and (1889) 10, part 2, 253–301.
- Schwartz, E. (1933). *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense*, Berlin and Leipzig, vol. I, part I.
- (1934). 'Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma', *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische* 10, Munich.
- Scorpan, C. (1980). *Limes Scythiae*, *BAR* 88, Oxford.
- Scullard, H.H. (1982). *From the Gracchi to Nero: a history of Rome from 133 BC to AD 68*, London (5th edition).
- Seager, R. (1979). *Pompey: a political biography*, Oxford.
- Seeck, O. (1901a). 'Collatio Lustralis', in *PW*, vol.IV, cols.370–376.
- (1901b). 'Comes rerum privatarum', in *PW*, vol.IV, cols.664–670.
- Segal, J.B. (1955). 'Mesopotamian Communities from Julian to the rise of Islam', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 41: 109–139.
- (1970). *Edessa, the blessed city*, Oxford.

- Segni, L. di (1999a). 'Epigraphic Documentation on building in the provinces of Palaestina and Arabia, 4th–7th century', in *The Roman and Byzantine Near East*, ed. J. Humphrey, vol.2, *JRA* supplementary series no. 31: 149–178.
- (1999b). 'New epigraphic discoveries at Scythopolis and in other sites of late-antique Palestine', *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma, 18–25 settembre 1997, Atti*, Rome, vol. II, 625–642.
- Segni, L. di and Hirschfeld, Y. (1986). 'Four Greek Inscriptions from Hammat Gader from the reign of Anastasius', *IEJ* 36: 251–268.
- Segrè, A. (1942–1943). 'Essays on Byzantine economic history, I. The *annona civica* and *annona militaris*', *Byzantion* 16: 393–444.
- Shahid, I. (1971). *The Martyrs of Najran: new documents*, Brussels.
- (1989). *Byzantium and the Arabs in the fifth century*, Washington.
- (1995). *Byzantium and the Arabs in the sixth century*, Washington, 2 vols.
- (2000). 'Byzantium and the Arabs in the sixth century à propos of a recent review', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 26: 125–160.
- Shaw, A.B. (1963). 'Byzantine Folles of Anastasius I', *The Numismatist* 76.2: 159–169.
- Shaw, B.D. (1990). 'Bandit Highlands and Lowland Peace: the mountains of Isauria – Cilicia', *JESHO* 33: 199–233, 237–270.
- Sinnigen, W.G. (1965). 'Administrative shifts of competence under Theoderic', *Traditio* 21: 456–467.
- Sijpesteijn, P.J. (1987). 'The title $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ ($\tau\eta\varsigma$) πόλεως and the papyri', *Tyche* 2: 171–174.
- Smith, S. (1954). 'Events in Arabia in the sixth century A.D.', *BSOAS* 16: 425–468.
- Smith W. and Wace, H., edd. (1877–1887). *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines*, London, 4 vols.
- Smith, W., ed. (1880). *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, London, 3 vols.
- Ste Croix, G.E.M. de, (1981). *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London.
- Stein, E. (1917). 'Kleine Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte', *Hermes* 52: 558–583.
- (1919). *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches vornehmlich unter den Kaiser Justinus II und Tiberius-Konstantinus*, Stuttgart.
- (1949–1959). *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 1 Paris (1959), vol. 2 ed. J.-R. Palanque, Paris–Brussels–Amsterdam (1949).
- Sundwall, J. (1919). *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums*, Helsingfors.
- Tchalenko, G. (1953). *Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord*, Paris.
- Théodoridès, J. (1958). 'Les animaux des jeux de l'hippodrome et des menageries impériales à Constantinople', *Byzantinoslavica* 19.1: 73–84.
- Thiel, A. (1868). *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae*, Braunsberg.

- Thompson, E.A. (1946). 'The Isaurians under Theodosius II', *Hermathena* 68: 18–31.
- (1982). *Romans and Barbarians. The decline of the Western Empire*, Madison.
- Tillemont, le Nain de L.S. (1738). *Histoire des empereurs et autre princes qui ont régné dans les six premiers siècles de l'église*, Paris, vol. VI.
- Tisserant, E. (1928). 'Michel le Syrien', *DTC*, vol. X, cols. 1711–1719.
- (1933). 'Flavien', *DTC*, vol. XII, cols. 1512–1513.
- Torrey, C.C. (1950–1951). 'Notes on the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23.1: 439–450.
- Toumanoff, C. (1949). Review of E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, Amsterdam, vol. II, *Traditio* 7: 481–490.
- (1963). *Studies in Christian Caucasian history*, Georgetown.
- (1971). 'Caucasia and Byzantium', *Traditio* 27: 111–158.
- Toynbee, Arnold (1973). *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World*, Oxford.
- Treadgold, W. (1995). *Byzantium and its Army 284–1081*, Stanford.
- Trombley, F.R. (1985). 'The decline of the seventh-century town: the exception of Euchaïta' in *Byzantine Studies in honour of Milton V. Anastos*, ed. S. Vryonis, *Byzantina kai Metabyzantina* 4: 65–90.
- (1987). 'Korykos in Cilicia Trachis: the economy of a small coastal city in late antiquity (saec. V–VI) – a précis', *Ancient History Bulletin* 1.1: 16–23.
- (1997). 'War and Society in rural Syria c.502–613 A.D.: observations on the epigraphy', *BMGS* 21: 154–209.
- Trombley, F.R. and Watt, J.W. (2000). *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*, Liverpool.
- Tsafir, Y. and Foerster, G. (1997). 'Urbanism at Scythopolis — Bet Shean in the fourth to seventh centuries', *DOP* 51: 85–146.
- Tsirpanlis, C.N. (1974). 'John Lydos on the Imperial Administration', *Byzantion* 44: 479–501.
- Turtledove, H. (1982). *The Chronicle of Theophanes: an English translation of anni mundi 6095–6305*, Philadelphia.
- Ullmann, W. (1970). *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, London (3rd edition).
- Valentini, G. (1957). *Contributi alla Cronologia albanese*, Rome, vol. II.
- Vasiliev, A.A. (1932). *Histoire de l'empire byzantin*, tr. P. Brodin and A. Bourguina, Paris, vol. I.
- (1948). 'The Monument of Porphyrius in the Hippodrome at Constantinople', *DOP* 4: 27–49.
- (1950). *Justin the First. An introduction to the epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- (1956). 'Notes on some episodes concerning the relations between the Arabs and the Byzantine Empire from the fourth to the sixth century', *DOP* 9–10: 306–316.
- Velkov, V. (1962). 'Les campagnes et la population rurale en Thrace au IV^e–

- VI^e siècle', *Byzantinobulgarica* I: 31–66.
- (1983). 'La Thrace et la Mésie intérieure pendant l'époque de la Basse Antiquité (IV–VIss.)', in *Ancient Bulgaria*, ed. A. Poulter, Nottingham, vol. II, 177–193.
- (1985). 'Frühbyzantinische Inschriften aus Dacia Ripensis', *Byzantina* 13.2: 883–891.
- Velkov, V. and Lisicov, S. (1994). 'An early Byzantine and medieval fort in the Haemus with an inscription and graffiti of the emperor Anastasius', in *Sbornik v chest na akad. Dimitur Angelov*, ed. V. Velkov, Sofia, 257–265.
- Vulpe, R. (1938). 'Histoire Ancienne de la Dobroudja', in *La Dobroudja*, Bucharest, 35–454.
- Vyver, A. van de (1937). 'Clovis et la politique méditerranéenne', *Etudes d'histoire dédiées à la mémoire de Henri Pirenne*, Paris, 367–387.
- Waddington, W.H. and Le Bas, P. (1870). *Voyage Archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, vol. III, *Inscriptions*, Paris.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M. (1962). *The Long-haired kings and other studies in Frankish history*, London.
- (1985). *The Barbarian West, 400–1000*, London (5th edition).
- Ward-Perkins, B. (1984). *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages: urban public building in northern and central Italy AD 300–850*, Oxford.
- Watt, J.W. (1999). 'Greek Historiography and the "chronicle of Joshua the Stylite"', in *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in honour of Professor Han J.W. Drijvers*, edd. G.T. Reinink and A.C. Klugkist, Leuven, 317–327.
- Wes, M.A. (1967). *Das Ende des Kaisertums im westen des römischen Reichs*, tr. K.E. Mittring, The Hague.
- Whitby, Mary (1998). 'Evagrius on patriarchs and emperors', in *The Propaganda of Power*, ed. M. Whitby, Leiden, Boston, Cologne, 321–344.
- Whitby, M. (1984). 'Procopius' Description of Martyropolis', *Byzantinoslavica* 45: 177–182.
- (1985). 'The Long Walls of Constantinople', *Byzantion* 55: 560–583.
- (1986a). 'Procopius and the Development of Roman Defences in Upper Mesopotamia', *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, edd. P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, *BAR* 553, Oxford, vol. II, 717–735.
- (1986b). 'Procopius' Description of Dara (Buildings II.1–3)' in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, edd. P. Freeman and D. Kennedy, *BAR* 553, Oxford, vol. II, 737–783.
- (1987). 'Notes on Justinianic Constructions', *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 26: 89–112.
- (1988). *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian: Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan warfare*, Oxford.
- (2000). *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, Liverpool.
- Whitby, M. and Whitby, M., tr. and comm. (1989). *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, Liverpool.

- Whitehouse, D. and Williamson, A. (1973). 'Sasanian Maritime Trade', *Iran* 11: 29–49.
- Whittow, M. (1990). 'Ruling the Late Roman and Early Byzantine city: a continuous history', *Past and Present* 129: 3–29.
- (1999). 'Rome and the Jafnids: writing the history of a sixth-century tribal dynasty', in *The Roman and Byzantine Near East*, ed. J. Humphrey, *JRA* supplementary series no. 31, vol. II, 207–244.
- Wickham, C.J. (1981). *Early Mediaeval Italy*, London.
- Wilkes, J.J. (1992). *The Illyrians*, Oxford.
- Williams, S. and Friell, G. (1999). *The Rome that did not fall*, London and New York.
- Winkler, S. (1961). 'Byzantinische Deme und Faktionen', in *Sozialökonomische verhältnisse im alten orient und im klassischen Altertum*, edd. R. Günther and G. Schrot, Berlin, 317–328.
- Wirth G. (1991). 'Anastasius, Christen and Perser', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 33: 81–139.
- Witakowski, W. (1984–1986). 'Chronicles of Edessa', *OS* 33–35: 487–98.
- (1991). 'Sources of Pseudo-Dionysius for the third part of his *Chronicle*', *OS* 40: 252–275.
- (1996). *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle, Part III*, Liverpool.
- Wolfram, H. (1988). *History of the Goths*, tr. T.J. Dunlap, Berkeley and London (revised).
- Wood, I. (1985). 'Gregory of Tours and Clovis', *Société pour les progrès des études, Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 63: 249–272.
- Wozniak, F.E. (1981). 'East Rome, Ravenna and West Illyricum: 454–536 A.D.', *Historia* 30: 351–382.
- Wright, W. (1884). *A Short History of Syriac Literature*, London.
- Zacos, G. and Vegler, A. (1959). 'An Unknown Solidus of Anastasius I', *NCirc* vol. 67, no. 9: 154–5.
- (1960). 'Marriage Solidi of the Fifth Century', *NCirc* vol. 68, no. 4: 73–74.
- Zeiller, J. (1967). *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire Romain*, Rome (2nd edition).

INDEX LOCORUM

Historical and Literary Sources

- Agapius of Manbidj**
PO 8.423: 151 n.154
- Agathias, *Historiae***
 5.13.5-6: 109 n.155
- Aimon of Fleury, *Historia Francorum***
 XXIII: 96 n.98
- Ammianus Marcellinus**
 XIX.13: 15 n.12
 XXVII.9.6: 15 n.12
- Anna Comnena, *Alexiades***
 X.5: 232 n.14
- Anonymus Valesianus**
 37f: 75 n.9
 40ff: 18 n.31
 49: 78 n.25
 50: 79 n.29
 53: 80 n.33
 54-56: 80 n.32
 57: 82 n.38
 60: 82 n.41
 64: 83 n.43
 66: 85 n.50
 74-76: 249 n.11
- Anthologia Graeca***
 II: 255 n.1
 II.398-406: 14 n.9
 II.405-406: 28 n.88
 IX.210: 255 n.1
 IX.210.10: 28 n.88
 IX.656: 235, 255 n.1
 IX.656.19: 28 n.88
 IX.674: 232 n.13
 XV.50: 177
 XVI.347: 178
 XVI.348: 178
 XVI.350: 177
- Antonius of Placentia**
 12.136.6-11: 242 n.60
- Athanasius, *Vit. Sev. (The Conflict of Severus)***
PO 4.600ff: 144 n.119
PO 4.622-623: 145 n.126
PO 4.641ff: 147 n.136
- Avitus**
ep. 34: 134 n.72
ep. 47: 100 n.117
ep. 83: 99 n.114
ep. 84: 99 n.115
- Bible: Old Testament**
 Jeremiah VI.22: 105 n.140
- Bible: New Testament**
 John 17.11: 154
- Candidus**
 fr. 1: 17 n.24
- Cassiodorus**
Chronicon
 500: 85 n.52
 504: 92 n.78
- Variae***
 I.1: 98 n.108
 I.1.1f: 98 n.109
 I.1.3: 87 n.56
 I.1.4-5: 87 n.57
 I.16: 97
 I.45f: 97 n.106
 II.6: 98 n.107
 II.38: 97
 III.1: 94 n.89
 III.2: 94 n.89
 III.3: 94 n.89
 III.4.4: 94 n.89
- Cedrenus**
 622: 4 n.16
 626: 127 n.39
 627: 194 n.51, 196 n.62
 628: 138 n.94, 141 n.105
 630: 259 n.31
 631: 157 n.189
 632: 165 n.234, 168 n.252, 169 n.258,
 172 n.282, 173 n.290
 632-633: 179 n.318
 633: 70 n.185
 635-636: 246 n.2, 247 n.4, 259 n.31
 692: 231 n.10
- Chronicon ad A.D. 846 pertinens***
 p.168: 155 n.180, 159 n.200

**Chronicon anonymum ad a.c. 1234
pertinens**

L-LI: 55 n.93

Chronicon Edessenicum

LXXXIII: 149 n.144

**Chronicon Miscellaneum ad A.D. 724
pertinens**

824: 70 n.184, 202 n.98

Chronicon Paschale

441: 15 n.16

498: 67 n.172, 226 n.209, 235 n.29, 259
n.31

517: 107 n.149, 108, 157 n.190, 258 n.21

518: 246 n.2, 247 n.4, 261 n.48

528: 234 n.27

626: 208 n.125

**Constantine Porphyrogenitus, de
Ceremoniis**

1.92: 1 n.1, 126 n.31, n.32, 262 n.57

1.92.246: 214 n.156

Corippus, In Laudem Iustini

1.28-65: 274 n.7

Cyril of Scythopolis

Vit. Abrah.

I: 31 n.4

Vit. Ioh.

13, 211.15-19: 56 n.100

Vit. Sab.

XXXIV: 234 n.26

LI: 261 n.43

LII: 261 n.43

LIII: 152 n.163

L-LIV: 152 n.161

LIV: 194 n.51, 207 n.123, 222 n.193,
252 n.23, 261 n.43, 284 n.7

LV: 242 n.58

LVI: 153 n.165, 158 n.198, 161 n.212,
n.213, n.214, 261 n.43

LVII: 161 n.216

LXI: 237 n.36

Damasclus, Vitae Isidori Reliquae

290: 16 n.19

Elias of Nisibis

814: 56 n.98

Ennodius

Panegyric

Pan. VIII.36.30ff: 79 n.29

Pan. XI.56: 85 n.52

Pan. XII.60.23-26: 92 n.75

Pan. XII.60.26ff: 92 n.79

Pan. XII.60.27: 92 n.76

Pan. XII.61.28-29: 92 n.76

Pan. XII.63-69: 92 n.80

Pan. XII.69.32-34: 92 n.77

Vit. Epiph.

LXXX.106ff: 200 n.88

Epistolae Austrasicae

no.20: 95 n.93

Eusebius, Life of Constantine

III: 238 n.42

Eustathius of Epiphania

fr. 4: 20 n.46

fr. 5: 23 n.63

fr. 6: 26 n.82, 53 n.87

Eutychius, Annales

10: 243 n.64

132: 56 n.99

Evagrius, Ecclesiastical History

I.19: 256 n.13

II.15: 256 n.13

III.1: 18 n.31

III.1-2: 5 n.21

III.26: 256 n.13

III.27: 18 n.34, 19 n.41, 20 n.50, n.51,
78 n.21

III.29: 1 n.5, 21 n.54, 23 n.60, n.61,
n.63, 256 n.13

III.30: 125-6 n.30, 127 n.36, 260 n.35

III.31: 145 n.127, 146 n.130, n.131, 148
n.142, 149 n.143, 155 n.176, 160
n.208

III.32: 127 n.39, 150 n.148, 151 n.155,
155 n.179, 259 n.35

III.34: 158 n.199, 160 n.209, 259 n.35

III.35: 20 n.45, 23 n.61, n.62, 25 n.73, 26
n.78, n.82, n.83, 27 n.84, 260 n.38

III.36: 31 n.6, 33 n.9, 260 n.38

III.37: 55 n.93, 67 n.172, 256 n.13, 260
n.36, n.38

III.38: 106 n.144, 107 n.148

III.39: 194 n.51, 195 n.56, n.59, 196
n.64, 260 n.36

III.40: 194 n.52

III.42: 199 n.79, 201 n.92, 207 n.121,
210 n.141, 284 n.7

III.43: 165 n.232, n.234, 168 n.252,
n.253, 169 n.261, n.263, 170 n.268,
177 n.310, 179 n.318, 221 n.191,
260 n.37

III.44: 148 n.138, n.141, 157 n.189,
n.190, 246 n.3, 260 n.37

IV.1: 248 n.8

V.24: 256 n.13

Ferrandus, Vita Fulgentii

13.27: 85 n.52

Georgius Monachus

619: 165 n.234

623-624: 127 n.38

624: 22 n.55, 127 n.39

624-625: 25 n.76, 137 n.89

Gregory of Tours, History of the Franks

II.38: 95, 266 n.85

Herodotus, Historiae

I.28: 13 n.3

II.17: 13 n.3

II.34: 13 n.3

VI.36: 107 n.147

VII.91: 13 n.3

Histoire Nestorienne

X: 126 n.33, 143 n.116

Historia Augusta

Probus 16.4-17.1: 14 n.11

Homer, Iliad

VI.184-185: 13 n.3

Ibn Habīb

al-Muhabbat pp.371-372: 35 n.18

Ibn Khaldūn

II.279-280: 35 n.17, n.20

James of Edessa

Chronicle

179: 149 n.144

Hymns

PO 7.715-717: 228 n.222

Jerome

*ep.*114: 15 n.12

John of Antioch

fr. 95: 283 n.1

fr. 206: 15 n.16

fr. 206.1: 17 n.27

fr. 214: 22 n.56, 249 n.12

fr. 214.3: 77 n.21

fr. 214.3-6: 78 n.21

fr. 214.5: 20 n.47

fr. 214.6: 20 n.50, n.51, 21 n.53

fr. 214b: 20 n.45, 22 n.56, 23 n.59, n.60,
n.62, n.65, n.66, 24 n.67, n.69, n.71,
25 n.73, 225 n.205

fr. 214c: 226 n.211, 228 n.222

fr. 214e: 190 n.32, 192 n.41, 257 n.17,
273 n.5

fr. 214e.1: 164 n.229, 165 n.234, 166
n.238, 167 n.247, n.248

fr. 214e.2: 75 n.12, 168 n.249, n.251,
221 n.188

fr. 214e.5: 169 n.261, n.264

fr. 214e.6: 170 n.266

fr. 214e.6-11: 170 n.268

fr. 214e.7: 170 n.270, 78 n.22

fr. 214e.8: 170 n.23

fr. 214e.11: 171 n.273

fr. 214e.12: 171 n.276, 227 n.215

fr. 214e.13: 172 n.279

fr. 214e.14: 172 n.281, n.282

fr. 214e.15: 70 n.185, 175 n.302

fr. 214e.16-17: 179 n.318

fr. 214e.17-18: 179 n.319

fr. 215: 222, 243 n.64

fr. 216: 70 n.184

John of Beith-Aphthonia, Vit. Sev.

PO 2.3.236-237: 149 n.145

PO 2.241: 157 n.192

John Chrysostom

eps. 13-15: 15 n.12

John of Ephesus, Lives of Eastern Saints

PO 17.143: 142 n.114

John Lydus, de Magistratibus

II.27.2: 198 n.73

III.17: 191 n.36, 284 n.6

III.26: 191 n.36

III.28: 70 n.182

III.45: 184 n.1

III.46: 252 n.23

III.47: 5 n.20, 221 n.188, 230 n.5, 262
n.52

III.48: 221 n.187

III.49: 192 n.38, 207 n.121, 210 n.140,
252 n.23, 262 n.52, 284 n.7

III.50: 190 n.32

III.51: 218 n.176

III.52: 49 n.69

III.53: 50 n.70, 57 n.109, 58 n.111, 262
n.52

III.58: 218 n.176

III.68-70: 218 n.176

John Moschus, Pratum Spiritale

38: 261 n.48

John of Nikiu

LXXXVIII.50f: 82 n.40

LXXXIX: 271

LXXXIX.30-31: 230 n.3

LXXXIX.40ff: 137 n.86

LXXXIX.46: 138 n.94

LXXXIX.48ff: 145 n.125

LXXXIX.54-68: 148 n.138

LXXXIX.59: 148 n.141

LXXXIX.64: 157 n.189

LXXXIX.69: 155 n.177

LXXXIX.72: 168 n.252

LXXXIX.76: 169 n.262

LXXXIX.77: 172 n.279

LXXXIX.78ff: 176 n.309

LXXXIX.81-84: 177 n.310

LXXXIX.86: 179 n.318

LXXXIX.87: 179 n.320

LXXXIX.93: 67 n.169, n.170, 246 n.2

Jordanes

Romana

333: 16 n.20

344: 75 n.9

349: 82 n.41, 265 n.80

352: 20 n.46

354-355: 23 n.64

355: 25 n.73

356: 97 n.104, 104 n.136, 105 n.141,

Jordanes, *Romana* 356 (cont.)

- 265 n.80
 358: 170 n.266
 359: 246 n.2, 266 n.81
Getica
 242: 75 n.9
 289: 77 n.21
 293-294: 80 n.32
 295: 80 n.34
 300-301: 92 n.79, 265 n.80
 301: 93 n.83
Joshua the Stylite
 passim: 22 n.55
 8: 50 n.71
 9-10: 50 n.72
 12: 18 n.31, 21 n.51
 13: 19 n.41, n.42
 14: 20 n.46, n.47
 15: 20 n.45
 16: 20 n.49
 17: 20 n.50, n.51, 21 n.51, n.53
 18: 50 n.74
 20: 42 n.53, 52 n.83
 23: 27 n.85, 31 n.5, 51 n.77
 24: 51 n.78, 52 n.80
 26: 267 n.88
 30: 140 n.100
 31: 194 n.51, 195 n.57, 267 n.89
 34: 267 n.88
 38: 267 n.88
 39ff: 267 n.88
 42: 221 n.190, 267 n.88
 48: 54 n.90, 54 n.91
 52: 56 n.100
 53: 55 n.97
 53ff: 55 n.93
 54: 57 n.105, n.106, n.108, 214 n.156
 56: 59 n.118, n.119
 57: 35 n.20
 58: 60 n.123, n.124
 59: 60 n.126
 60: 164 n.229
 61: 61 n.129, n.130
 61-65: 61 n.131
 64: 62 n.137
 66: 62 n.138, n.139
 67-68: 62 n.140
 70: 62 n.135, n.136
 71: 63 n.144
 75: 63 n.145, n.146
 76: 62 n.137
 78: 63 n.148
 79: 63 n.147
 81: 64 n.149
 87 66 n.162
 89: 66 n.162

- 91: 65 n.159, 66 n.162
 92: 65 n.153
 93-96: 65 n.153
 97: 64 n.150
 99-100: 65 n.154
Landolfus Sagax
 XVII: 264 n.73
 XVII.215: 151 n.155, 152 n.158
 XVII.216: 133 n.68
Liber Pontificalis
 I.252f: 128 n.43
 I.252-253: 124 n.27
 I.258-259: 133 n.66
 I.260: 133 n.69
 I.260-262: 134 n.74
 I.269: 173 n.291, 175 n.299
 I.269-270: 181 n.330
Liberatus, Brev.
 XIX: 151 n.154
Life of Samuel
 XVIII.8-11: 241 n.53
 XXII.3-4: 241 n.54
Malalas, Chronographia
 383: 78 n.23
 386: 21 n.52, 226 n.212
 387: 19 n.41, n.42
 388: 20 n.45, n.46
 389: 20 n.51, 21 n.53
 390: 4 n.14
 391: 4 n.15
 392: 4 n.17, 262 n.55, 283 n.2
 392-393: 227 n.216
 393: 24 n.68, 27 n.85, 224 n.202, 226 n.212
 393-394: 25 n.73, 256 n.6
 393-395: 22 n.56
 394: 25 n.74, 26 n.79, 199 n.79, 201 n.91, 235 n.29
 394-395: 226 n.209
 395: 226 n.210, 256 n.7
 395-398: 256 n.7
 396: 46 n.61
 398: 197 n.70, 54 n.90, 194 n.51, 195 n.59, 227 n.217, 231 n.8
 398-399: 256 n.7
 399: 192 n.42, 256 n.6, 256 n.13, 259 n.31
 400: 137 n.91, 191 n.37, 202 n.94, 207 n.121, 284 n.7
 401-402: 138 n.95, 227 n.218
 402: 164 n.231, 165 n.232, n.234, 166 n.236, 167 n.248, 168 n.252, 169 n.261, n.262
 402-403: 170 n.268
 402-406: 256 n.8
 403-405: 284 n.7

- 404: 176 n.307, 249 n.12
 405: 172 n.279, 179 n.320, 177 n.310
 405-406: 176 n.309
 406: 70 n.185, 179 n.318, 221 n.191, 231 n.9, 256 n.6
 406-408: 256 n.10, 258 n.21
 408: 157 n.190
 408-409: 247 n.4, 259 n.31, 261 n.48
 409: 230 n.2
 412: 250 n.16
 417-418: 242-3 n.61
 433-434: 42 n.50
 435-436: 234 n.27
 449-450: 50 n.71
 499: 246 n.2
de insid. 36: 226 n.212
de insid. 37: 24 n.72, 26 n.82
de insid. 39: 226 n.211, n.212
Malchus
 passim: 18 n.31
 fr. 1: 43 n.55
 fr. 2: 17 n.29
 fr. 3: 5 n.21
 fr. 5: 5 n.21
 fr. 7: 7 n.25
 fr. 15.20-22: 77 n.18
 fr. 15-17: 77 n.20
 fr. 16: 5 n.21, 7 n.25
 fr. 18: 107 n.146
 fr. 18.3: 5 n.21
 fr. 20: 243 n.64
Marcellinus comes
 471: 17 n.28
 476: 75 n.9
 483: 77 n.21
 485: 21 n.52
 487: 78 n.23
 488: 21 n.53
 491: 22 n.56, 225 n.205
 492: 24 n.68, 25 n.73, 26 n.77
 493: 104 n.134, 273 n.6
 494: 263 n.61
 497: 26 n.79
 498: 26 n.81, 27 n.84, n.85, 202 n.96
 499: 104 n.135, n.136
 501: 226 n.211, 263 n.59
 502: 55 n.97, 105 n.137, 142 n.112
 502-504: 263 n.60
 503: 57 n.106, 64 n.149
 504: 63 n.147
 505: 92 n.79, 93 n.83
 508: 97 n.104, n.105
 509: 232 n.12
 511: 149 n.144, 150 n.148
 512: 99 n.112, 152 n.164, 153 n.165, n.169, 157 n.188, n.191, 179 n.317, 258 n.21
 514: 165 n.232, 166 n.237, 167 n.248, 167 n.243, 168 n.250, n.255, 169 n.257, 263 n.62
 514.3: 169 n.264, 172 n.281
 515: 70 n.185, 171 n.273, 172 n.279, 175 n.302
 516: 161 n.212, 163 n.225, 176 n.304
 517: 105 n.139, 222 n.193
 518: 69 n.176, n.177
 519.3: 257 n.18
Menander Rhetor
 II.377: 274 n.8
Michael Glycas, Annals
 IV.265: 231 n.10
Michael the Syrian
 IX.6: 78 n.23
 IX.7: 53 n.87, 268 n.98
 IX.7-11: 268 n.97
 IX.8: 141 n.106, 153 n.165, 221 n.191, 268 n.98
 IX.9: 149 n.143, n.144, 164 n.231, 268 n.98
 IX.10: 153 n.170, 268 n.98
 IX.11: 58 n.115, 70 n.184
Narrationes Variae
 xvii-xviii: 55 n.97
Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos
 XVI.12: 124 n.25
 XVI.19: 127 n.40, n.42
 XVI.20: 2 n.8, 126 n.32
 XVI.25: 243 n.61
 XVI.26: 138 n.94
 XVI.27: 155 n.179
 XVI.32: 152 n.161
 XVI.34: 161 n.214
 XVI.36: 23 n.61
 XVI.37: 67 n.172, 69 n.180
 XVI.38: 165 n.232
 XVI.40: 194 n.51
 XVI.40-41: 194 n.52
 XVI.44: 199 n.79
Nonnosus
FHG IV.179: 33 n.10
Oracle of Apollo (Delphi, 511)
 43-47: 154 n.172
 126-131: 154 n.173
Oracle of Baalbek
 165ff: 262 n.55
 166-168: 5 n.19
 168-170: 262 n.56
Paul the Deacon, Historia Romana
 XIV: 16-17: 78 n.25
 XVI: 264
 XVI.2: 126 n.34

Paul of Elusa, *Vita Theognii*

11: 242 n.60

Philostorgius

XI.8: 15 n.12

Pliny, *ep. ad Traj.*

X.41f: 232 n.14

X.61f: 232 n.14

Priscian of Caesarea, *Panegyric*

10-129: 28 n.88

15-18: 14 n.9

19-37: 22 n.55

52-60: 24 n.66

81: 13 n.3

84-86: 14 n.8

101: 273

103-117: 25 n.75

104-106: 273

119ff: 27 n.85

149: 277

149-161: 194 n.51

152-153: 195 n.56

171-173: 26 n.83

181: 238 n.44

194-197: 207 n.121, n.123

194-195: 276

204-205: 214 n.156

218-227: 228 n.222

223-227: 276 n.13

239-245: 102 n.125

248-253: 192

254-260: 274

265: 273

265-266: 102 n.128

298-300: 272

299-300: 58 n.115

300: 275

Priscus

fr. 10: 15 n.15

fr. 15: 16 n.19

fr. 53.1: 17 n.23

Procopius of Caesarea*de Aed.*

I.1.21: 238 n.43

I.1.25: 238 n.43

II.3.1ff: 238 n.43

II.3.26: 69 n.179

III.3-4: 54 n.91

III.4.1-9: 65 n.157

III.4.19: 65 n.158

III.5.4-12: 56 n.103

IV.4: 243 n.65

IV.5.6: 15 n.16

IV.7.18: 112 n.173

IV.7.20: 113 n.175

IV.9.6: 107 n.148

IV.9.7: 108 n.153

IV.11.19: 112 n.174

IV.11.20: 111 n.163, 113 n.175

VI.5-9: 248 n.10

Anecdota

XIX.7: 184 n.2

XXIV.12-14: 216 n.169

XXIV.27-29: 189 n.22

XXV: 218 n.176, n.177

XXV.6: 219 n.180

XXVII.8-10: 237 n.36

B.G.

I.1.4-6: 75 n.9

I.1.9: 78 n.23

I.1.10: 78 n.25

III.6.10-26: 77 n.16

V.1.25: 80 n.32

V.1.29: 84 n.45

V.5.2ff: 27 n.86

V.6.4-5: 87 n.59

VI.6.14-22: 84 n.47

VI.6.23: 84 n.46

VII.6.2: 27 n.86

VII.20.4-16: 27 n.86

VII.21.22-23: 103 n.132

VII.33.4: 96 n.102

VII.33.8: 98 n.110

VII.34.10: 98 n.110

VII.36.7-14: 27 n.86

VII.38.6-8: 105 n.138

B.P.

I.2.1-10: 48 n.64

I.5.2: 51 n.79

I.7: 55 n.93

I.7.1-2: 52 n.84

I.7.3: 53 n.87, 55 n.93

I.8.1: 57 n.105

I.8.1-3: 57 n.109

I.8.3: 164 n.229

I.8.4: 214 n.156

I.8.10: 60 n.120

I.8.11: 60 n.121

I.9.1: 62 n.136

I.9.1-3: 62 n.137

I.9.4: 64 n.149

I.9.5-19: 59 n.119

I.10.9-11: 50 n.73

I.10.18-19: 54 n.91

I.11.1: 248 n.8

I.14.11-15: 252 n.23

I.16.4: 50 n.73

I.19.1-7: 43 n.55

I.24.2: 223 n.199

II.5.4-7: 67 n.171

II.12.26: 60 n.123

II.24.16: 57 n.107

B.V.

III.6.5-25: 17 n.23

Procopius of Gaza, *Panegyric*

9: 13 n.3, 22 n.55, 24 n.70

9-10: 28 n.88

10: 27 n.85

13: 194 n.51, 195 n.55, n.59

16: 228 n.222

18: 232 n.11

19: 232 n.17

21: 107 n.148

30: 190 n.30

Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre,*Chronicle*

814: 55 n.96, 56 n.98

815: 221 n.191

816: 63 n.147

818: 157 n.189

823: 157 n.192

826: 159 n.200

837: 250 n.15

846: 42 n.50

Severus*Homily 57, PO 4.1.83-94: 37 n.29**Homily 125, PO 29.1.249: 162 n.217**On Vitalian the Tyrant, PO 7.710: 179*

n.320

Ordination speech PO 2.322ff: 155

n.182

*Philalethes 113: 144 n.121**Sel. Let.*

I.1: 146 n.131, 269 n.109

I.2: 125 n.28, 269 n.109

I.3: 158 n.194

I.20: 269 n.109

I.21: 160 n.209

I.24: 160 n.210

I.27: 208 n.125

IV.2: 152 n.159, 154 n.174

IV.6: 144 n.123

VI.1: 182 n.322

Severus of Ashmunain, *History of the**Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of**Alexandria**PO 1.448: 156 n.183***Souda**

Anastasius 2077: 243 n.64

Eustathius 3746: 256 n.13

Lingis 511: 24 n.68

Strabo

XIV.5.6: 13 n.5

Tacitus, *Historiae*

4.74: 205 n.114

Theodore Lector

399: 17 n.23

437: 20 n.47

438: 21 n.53

441: 2 n.7, 127 n.38

442: 127 n.42

444: 140 n.100

445: 2 n.8, 126 n.32

446: 127 n.39

448: 127 n.37

449: 24 n.71, 25 n.73, 26 n.77, n.79

449-450: 137 n.89

449f: 25 n.76

452: 138 n.96

455: 137 n.93, 227 n.213

456: 138 n.94

461: 133 n.67, n.68

467: 142 n.111

468: 230 n.4

477: 147 n.133

481: 147 n.135

483-486: 148 n.140

487: 149 n.143

487ff: 259 n.35

490: 151 n.154

491: 149 n.144

492: 151 n.155

497ff: 260 n.35

503: 166 n.237, 167 n.241

504: 152 n.158

509: 169 n.258

510: 172 n.282

511: 172 n.281

513: 158 n.197

517ff: 161 n.215

521: 163 n.224

524: 246 n.2

552: 52 n.84

553: 194 n.51

558: 69 n.180

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *History of the Monks of Syria*

X.5: 13 n.3, 15 n.12

Theodosius, *de situ Terrae Sanctae*

20.121.21-28: 242 n.60

Theophanes, *Chronographia*

AM 5900: 48 n.64

AM 5961: 17 n.23

AM 5975: 21 n.52

AM 5976: 20 n.51

AM 5977: 20 n.50, 78 n.21, n.23

AM 5980: 21 n.53

AM 5982: 1 n.5, 2 n.7, 126 n.30, 127

n.38, 137 n.86, 140 n.100, 258 n.24

AM 5983: 2 n.8, 4 n.15, 20 n.51, 21

n.54, 126 n.32, n.33, 127 n.37, n.39,

n.40, n.42

AM 5983-5984: 23 n.61

AM 5984: 23 n.59, 138 n.96

Theophanes, *Chronographia* (cont.)

- AM 5985: 22 n.56, 23 n.63, 24 n.69,
n.70, n.71, 25 n.73, 26 n.77
AM 5985-5986: 24 n.72
AM 5986: 25 n.74
AM 5987: 25 n.76, 137 n.89
AM 5987-5988: 23 n.62
AM 5988: 26 n.77, n.78, n.79, n.81, 27
n.84, n.85, 137 n.93, 138 n.94
AM 5990: 31 n.6, 36 n.22, 42 n.54
AM 5991: 141 n.104
AM 5993: 194 n.51, 228 n.222
AM 5994: 105 n.137
AM 5995: 33 n.10, 35 n.19
AM 5996: 52 n.84, 53 n.87, 54 n.90, 55
n.97
AM 5997: 57 n.109, 59 n.117
AM 5998: 62 n.136, 63 n.146, n.147, 64
n.149, 192 n.42
AM 5999: 141 n.107, 142 n.111
AM 6002: 147 n.133, n.135
AM 6003: 147 n.137, 148 n.139, n.140,
152 n.164, 153 n.165
AM 6004: 138 n.94, 149 n.144, 150
n.149, 151 n.154, 155 n.178
AM 6005: 158 n.197, 161 n.213, n.214,
164 n.229, 166 n.237, 167 n.243,
168 n.254, 179 n.317
AM 6006: 165 n.234, 168 n.252, 170
n.265, n.268, 172 n.279, n.281,
n.282
AM 6007: 179 n.318
AM 6008: 163 n.224
AM 6010: 246 n.1, n.2, 247 n.4
AM 6020: 234 n.27
AM 6035: 42 n.50
AM 6051: 27 n.86

Victor of Tununna, *Chronicle*

- 488.2: 21 n.53
491: 2 n.8, 126 n.32, 127 n.39
495: 26 n.77, n.79
497: 140
499: 140
510: 164 n.229, 166 n.237, 169 n.257
514: 172 n.279
518: 263 n.64

Vita Danielis Stylitae

- 55: 17 n.24
65: 17 n.25, 107 n.146
77: 77 n.18

Ya'qūbī, *Historiae*

- I.205: 36 n.24
I.235: 34 n.14

Zachariah of Mytilene, *Historia**Ecclesiastica*

- III (prologue): 269 n.104
VI.6: 78 n.22
VII.1: 4 n.13, 5 n.18, 126 n.35, 127
n.40, 137 n.92
VII.2: 22 n.55, 269 n.106
VII.3: 50 n.73, 54 n.91, 55 n.93
VII.4: 56 n.98, 57 n.109, 59 n.116
VII.5: 59 n.119, 64 n.149, 65 n.153
VII.6: 67 n.172, 68 n.174, n.175, 69
n.178
VII.7-8: 269 n.105
VII.8: 150 n.148, n.150, 151 n.154
VII.9: 191 n.37, 269 n.104
VII.10: 153 n.165, n.170, 155 n.179
VII.12: 159 n.200, n.203, 269 n.104
VII.13: 164 n.230, 165 n.232, 166
n.238, 167 n.241, 168 n.253, 171
n.272, 269 n.106
VIII.2: 165 n.232, 166 n.237, 171 n.272

Zachariah Scholasticus, *Vita Severi*

- PO 2.52: 144 n.117
PO 2.59-60: 191 n.34
PO 2.65: 191 n.34
PO 2.107-108: 146 n.131
PO 2.109: 149 n.147
PO 2.111: 153 n.166
PO 2.113: 138 n.94

Zonaras

- XIV.1-2: 18 n.31
XIV.3.5-8: 127 n.39
XIV.3.11: 194 n.51
XIV.3.20: 23 n.59
XIV.3.22: 24 n.70
XIV.3.26: 104 n.133, n.134
XIV.3.28: 168 n.252
XIV.3.29-30: 176 n.309
XIV.3.35-36: 165 n.232
XIV.3.37: 157 n.189
XIV.4.8-10: 104 n.136
XIV.4.23: 234 n.28
XIV.31-35: 4 n.16
XVII.8.23: 184 n.2

Zosimus

- I.69-70: 14 n.11
II.38: 194 n.52, 195 n.56

Correspondence and Documents concerning
Religious Policy*Acta synhodorum habitarum Romae*

- Anagnosticum Regis, 14: 89 n.64
Relatio Episcoporum ad Regem, 9-12:
132 n.61

Coleman-Norton (1966)

- 955-956: 173 n.285

Concilii Chalcedonensis Actio

- V.34: 120 n.16

Gunther (1895-1898)

- 79: 89 n.65, 130 n.55
95: 129 n.52
104: 135 n.76
105: 163 n.226, 164 n.227
107: 173 n.286
108: 173 n.289
109: 173 n.285
110: 173 n.292, 264 n.69
111: 180 n.322
112: 181 n.326
113: 100 n.120, 180 n.325, 264 n.71
113.4: 87 n.58
114: 101 n.124
114.7: 87 n.58
115: 173 n.294
116: 173 n.293, 264 n.70
116a: 175 n.298
116b: 174 n.297
117: 163 n.222
125: 175 n.300, n.301
126-128: 181 n.330
137: 180 n.324, 181 n.328
138: 181 n.331
139: 162 n.218
140: 162 n.219

Jaffé (1885-1888)

- 619: 128 n.49
620: 129 n.50
622: 130 n.57
632: 129 n.51, 131 n.59
638: 128 n.47
664: 128 n.48
744: 132 n.63, 264 n.67
752ff: 134 n.72
763: 163 n.222
771: 173 n.289
773: 173 n.292, 264 n.69
774: 173 n.293, 264 n.70
775: 173 n.294
779: 181 n.326
789-794: 181 n.330
800: 162 n.220

Mansi (1762)

- VIII: 264 n.66
VIII.5ff: 129 n.50
VIII.7: 136 n.84
VIII.46f: 128 n.47
VIII.50ff: 128 n.48
VIII.63ff: 128 n.48
VIII.186: 137 n.91
VIII.188: 264 n.67
VIII.188ff: 132 n.63
VIII.213-217: 135 n.77
VIII.213ff: 264 n.68
VIII.221: 163 n.222
VIII.230ff: 134 n.72
VIII.370-374: 153 n.165
VIII.376ff: 161 n.214
VIII.384: 173 n.286
VIII.386: 264 n.70
VIII.388: 173 n.292, 264 n.69
VIII.389: 173 n.293
VIII.393: 173 n.294
VIII.398: 180 n.326
VIII.412-418: 181 n.330
VIII.1024: 162 n.220

Schwartz (1934)

- 16ff: 130 n.57
19ff: 129 n.51
153-157: 135 n.77

Thiel (1868)

- 312ff: 129 n.50
320: 128 n.44
335f: 89 n.65, 130 n.55
341ff: 130 n.54, n.57
349ff: 130 n.54
349-358: 129 n.51, 131 n.59
358-359: 128 n.46
382ff: 128 n.47
392ff: 130 n.54
392-414: 129 n.52
392ff: 128 n.48
557-570: 131 n.61
615f: 264 n.67
615-623: 132 n.63
628ff: 132 n.65
700-708: 135 n.77
700ff: 264 n.68
708f: 136 n.82
709: 163 n.222
741: 173 n.285
742: 173 n.286
742-745: 163 n.226

742ff: 164 n.227
 745: 173 n.289
 747: 173 n.292, 264 n.69
 748: 264 n.70
 748ff: 173 n.293
 755f: 173 n.294
 756-761: 163 n.224
 761: 175 n.300

764: 180 n.322
 765: 100 n.120, 180 n.325, 264 n.71
 766: 180 n.326
 767: 101 n.124
 772-774: 163 n.223
 796-806: 181 n.330
 813: 181 n.331
 820ff: 162 n.220

Inscriptions

Callu (1982)

732: 217

CIL

VI.1794: 86 n.53
 IX.3568: 86 n.53
 X.1.6850: 86 n.54

di Segni & Hirschfeld (1986)

253-257: 234 n.22
 258-260: 234 n.23
 260-262: 234 n.24
 262-263: 234 n.25

di Segni (1999b)

636: 237 n.34
 638: 237 n.37
 639: 238 n.38

Gatier and Ulbert (1991)

169-182: 39 n.35

IGLS

II.151f: 66 n.164
 V.2204: 67 n.168

ILS

825: 86 n.53
 827: 86 n.54

Littmann, Magie, Stuart (1921)

24-42, no. 20: 215 n.162

250-1, no. 562: 215 n.162

Mango (1972)

379-382: 71 n.187
 382-384: 71 n.188

Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua III (1931)

125 no.197 A & B: 210 n.139

Oliverio (1936)

135-163: 215 n.162

Prentice (1908)

76ff: 67 n.167
 79f no. 992: 67 n.166

Prentice (1922)

80 no. 993: 66 n.165

Sartre (1982a)

no. 9045: 215 n.162
 no. 9046: 215 n.162

SEG

IX.356: 215 n.162
 XLI.1537: 39 n.35

Waddington (1870)

III no.1906: 215 n.162
 III no.2033: 215 n.162

Papyri

P.Oxy 1909

196 n.60

Legislation

Codex Iustinianus

CJ I.2.18: 221 n.189
 CJ I.4.9: 284 n.5
 CJ I.4.18: 209 n.138
 CJ I.4.19 (I.55.11): 209 n.137
 CJ I.22.6: 223
 CJ I.30.3: 222 n.194
 CJ I.34.1: 198 n.73
 CJ I.34.2: 213 n.154
 CJ I.42.1-2: 222 n.194

CJ I.55.8: 209 n.136
 CJ II.7.20: 223
 CJ II.7.21-23: 223
 CJ II.7.23: 284 n.5
 CJ II.7.24: 223 n.197
 CJ II.7.25: 184 n.3
 CJ II.4.43: 223
 CJ III.13.7: 223, 284 n.4
 CJ IV.35.22: 284 n.5
 CJ IV.41: 218 n.178

CJ V.17.9: 222
 CJ V.27.6: 222
 CJ V.30.4: 191 n.34, 223
 CJ V.62.25: 223
 CJ V.70.5: 223
 CJ VI.20.18: 284 n.4
 CJ VI.21.16: 283 n.2
 CJ VI.58.11: 222, 284 n.4
 CJ VII.39.4: 283 n.1
 CJ VII.51.6: 223
 CJ VIII.48.5: 222, 284 n.4
 CJ VIII.53.32: 284 n.3
 CJ X.16.13: 221 n.187, 284 n.3
 CJ X.19.9: 207 n.122, 284 n.3
 CJ X.27.1: 200 n.90, 283 n.1
 CJ X.27.2-3: 201 n.91
 CJ X.27.1-3: 199 n.79
 CJ XI.1.1: 195 n.59
 CJ XI.1.1-2: 194 n.51
 CJ XI.43.11: 231 n.10
 CJ XI.48.19: 212 n.150
 CJ XI.51.1: 185 n.6
 CJ XI.62.14: 283 n.1
 CJ XII.1.18: 222 n.196
 CJ XII.2.2: 185 n.7
 CJ XII.5.5: 222 n.195
 CJ XII.10.2: 222 n.195
 CJ XII.16.5: 222 n.195

CJ XII.35.18: 214 n.161
 CJ XII.37.16.2-4: 214 n.160
 CJ XII.37.19.1: 209 n.138
 CJ XII.44.3: 214 n.156
 CJ XII.49.12: 222 n.195
 CJ XII.50.23: 222 n.196
 CJ XII.54.5: 223 n.198

Codex Theodosianus

C.Th. V.18.1: 212 n.148
 C.Th. VII.4.32: 199 n.82
 C.Th. IX.21.7: 187 n.15

Justinian

Novels

XXXVIII: 207 n.124
 XLIII: 194 n.51
 CIII: 216
 CXXVIII.7,8: 213 n.153
 CLXVI: 213 n.153
 CLXVIII: 213 n.153

Edict

XIII.15: 208 n.127

Leo VI, Novel

46: 211 n.144

Majorian, Novel

II.3: 200 n.85

Valentinian III, Novel

XII.46: 199-200
 XXXI.451: 212 n.149

GENERAL INDEX

- Abel, Stylite at Qartmin 241
 Abgar, Prince of Edessa 60 n.123
 Abraham, Bishop of Resafa 38
 Abū Ya'fur 39
 Abydus 45 n.60, 218-19
 Abydus Edict 217
 Acacian schism 9, 71, 81, 88-9, 103-4, 115, 121, 123-4, 128, 130; ending of 250-1
 Acacius: and the *Henoticon* 123-4; see also Acacian schism
 acclamations 1, 5-6, 224 n.200
 Acrae 170, 171 n.277, 172
actuarii 214
adaeratio 197, 199
adictio sterilium 213 n.153
 Adige, river 79
 Adrianopolis 105 n.141
adscripticius/ii 212
 Aegean Sea 218
 Aegissus 113 n.175
 Aelia Flacilla 205
 Aelia Verina 205
 Aetius 74
 Africa, North, uprising in 70; grain requisition from 185 n.8; and coinage reform 204
 Agapitus 98
 Agapius of Menbidj, *Book of Time* 270
agens in rebus 46 n.61
 agrarian legislation 184, 211-13; land and the economy 185-7, 189-90, 197-9; commutation of the land tax 199-202
 Aila 43 n.55, 161
 Alamans 94
 Alaric 76 n.13
 Alaric II, Visigothic King 94
 Alathar, *magister militum per Thracias* 170-1
 Albinus Niger 198
 Alcison (Alcissus), Bishop of Nicopolis 148, 155 n.176, 160 n.208, 163, 260
 Alexander, Governor of Hammat Gader 233-4
 Alexander Severus, Emperor 194 n.52
 Alexandretta near the Issus 56 n.99
 Alexandria: Alexandrian doctrine 117; ambitions of the see of Alexandria 121-4, 129, 138-9; response to Severus' ordination 155-6; *vindex* 208; riots 227; lighthouse 232, 245, 278;
 Almafreda 94
 Amalasuntha 88 n.63, 98 n.110, 193 n.49, 251
 Amantius 246-8
 Amanus Mountains 13
 Ambazouces 50 n.73
 Ambrose, Bishop of Milan 115 n.2, 131 n.60
 Amida: fall of to Persia 54-7, 61; Roman siege 59, 62-3; surrender 63-5; sources for the sieges and fall 256, 261, 267-70
 Ammonius, patrician 232 n.13
 Ammudis 68
 Amorkesos (Imru' al-Qays) 8, 42-3
 Anasartha 66
 Anastasia 152
 Anastasiopolis 244; see also Dara, Resafa/Sergiopolis
 Anastasius, *dux* 161
 Anastasius, Emperor *passim*; accession 1, 3, 5-6; early interest in the Church 2; silentiary 2-4, 190, 229, 258; marries Ariadne 4; appearance and personality 4-5; war with the Isaurians 6-7, 21-8; administrative and economic reforms 7-8, 184, 190-229; building programme 7, 9, 65-70, 106-14, 230-45; diplomacy towards the Arabs 8, 29ff; Persian war 8, 47-65; relations with Theoderic 8, 80ff, 91-3; western alliances 8-9, 94-100; Church politics 9, 89-91, 100-2, 115-16, 125-64, 172-5, 180-3; foreign policy in the Balkans 104-6; revolt of Vitalian 164-80; death 246-7; assessment of reign 249-53
 Anastasius II, Pope 88, 90, 132-3, 136 n.83, 264
 Anastasius Paulus Probus Sabinianus Pompeius Anastasius, Flavius 193, 228 n.221
 Anastasius Paulus Probus Moschianus Probus Magnus, Flavius 193
 Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople 119
 Anazarbus 208
 Anchialus 168, 179
 Ancyra 19
 Andrew, Bishop of Samos 140-1
 Andrew, Bishop of Thessalonica 133
 Anicia Juliana 58, 152
 Anicii 102 n.127
 Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius, Fl. 193 n.49
annona: and Vitalian 166-7; in the third century 185; commutation 189 n.22, 199-201, 212, 216
 Anonymus Valesianus 78, 82, 83, 248, 265
 Antes 105 n.138
 Anthemius, Emperor 19, 77
 Anthemius, Emperor Anthemius' son 190
 Antioch: Antiochene doctrine 117-18; *vindex* 208; building projects 231; Malalas 255-6; Evagrius 259; see also riots; Severus of Antioch; synods
 Antoninus Pius 14 n.10
 Apadna 59
 Apamea 127 n.40
 Apion 57, 58 n.110, 62, 192 n.41, 284 n.6, 284 n.8
 Apollinarianism 117
 Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea 116
 Apskal 24
 Apulia 97, 200
 Aqaba (gulf of) 8, 43, 45 n.60
 Aquileia 79
 Aquilinus, *comes* 104, 105 n.136
 Aquitaine 94
 Arabia (Arabs): Roman and Persian relations with Arab tribes 29-43, 47; military edict 44-6, 214-16; role in the Persian war 52, 53, 56, 59-61
 Arbazacius 15
 Arcadiopolis 17
 Arcadius, Emperor 48, 205, 238
 Arcadius, praetorian prefect 3, 4
archon of the straits 218-19
 Ardaburius 16-17
 Areobindus 15, 35 n.18, 57-63, 108, 157, 179, 192 n.41, 228 n.221, 262
 Arethas (Ghassanid) 33, 35, 36 n.21
 Arethas (Kindite) 33-5, 36 n.22, 42 n.54; see also al-Harith
argentarii 187 n.14
 Ariadne 1-5, 16, 17 n.22, 19, 24 n.72, 126, 150, 152, 190, 205
 Aristus 104, 105 n.136
 Arius of Alexandria 116; Arians, Arianism 76, 85, 89, 94, 99, 122, 127; Theoderic 128, 136
 Armatus 18 n.33
 Armenia (Armenians) 15, 20, 70, 252; role in the Persian war 29, 48, 52, 53-4, 56, 63; Church of Armenia 143 n.115; Persarmenia 62-3
 army: role in accession 1, 2, 247-9; imperial army and the Isaurian revolt 24, 26; reforms 44-6, 213-16; imperial army and the Persian war 47, 57-8, 60, 62; Vitalian 165-7, 169; organisation of the army and the economy 184-9, 199-202, 229
 Arnegisclus 15
 Arsenius, father of Silvanus 238
 Arsenius, son of Silvanus 237 n.36
 Arsinoe 197 n.68
 Arzanene 62
 Asiaticus 158
 Aspar 15-17, 58, 76, 89 n.64, 220 n.185
 Asterius, Bishop of Calenderis 158
 Asterius, Turcius Rufius Apronianus 225 n.206
 al-Aswad 35 n.18
 Athalaric 88 n.63, 251
 Athanasius 144
 Athanasius II, Patriarch of Alexandria 136, 138, 153
 Athanasius Scriptor: *Conflict of Severus* 143 n.116, 271
 Athenodorus, senator 3, 23-6, 137
 Athenodorus 23 n.62, 26
 Athlar 15, 74, 76, 91 n.74, 104 n.133
 Attalus III, King of Pergamum 13
 Attila 15, 74, 76, 91 n.74, 104 n.133
 Augustus 75 n.9, 101
 Aurelian 185 n.8
aurum coronarium 189 n.22
aurum oblativum 189 n.22
aurum tironum 201 n.91
 Avars 109, 112
 Avitus, Bishop of Vienne 99, 181
 Bacchus, St. 37, 39
 Badicharimos 33, 35, 42 n.54
 Bahram V 48
 Balash, King of Persia 50
 Balkans: in the fifth century 76-7; Church politics 89-90, 163-4; war between Theoderic and Anastasius

- 91-3, 97-9; raids 104ff; improvements to defences 109-14; Vitalian and 164-7
- Bar Hebraeus (Gregory Abul Faraj) 68 n.172, 268
- Barsauma, Bishop 48 n.65
- Basil, *comes* 61
- Basil II, Emperor 184 n.2
- Basil of Caesarea 46 n.60, 144
- Basiliscus I n.4, 6-7, 11 n.1, 17-18, 23, 77, 123, 203, 220
- Bassinae 98 n.110
- Batnae 60, 61 n.131, 66
- Bawi 60-1, 65
- Beersheba inscriptions 215-16
- Beirut 144, 191
- Belisarius 84
- Beroe 112
- Beroea 37, 68 n.173
- Birha 66
- Bithrapsa 31
- Black Sea 106, 111-12, 114, 218
- Blases, King of Persia 51
- Blemmyes 42
- Boethius 251
- Bosphorus 168, 176, 177 n.311
- Bostra 37, 44, 241; Edict 215
- Bousalbus 19
- Bouz el-Khanzir 66
- Britain 74
- Brytae Festival 225 n.204, 226, 228, 257, 263
- bucellarii* 16
- building programme: Resafa 37-9; improvements to defences on the eastern frontier 65-70; the Long Wall 106-9; improvements to defences in the Balkans 109-14; utilitarian projects 231ff; Caesarea 232-3; Hammat Gader 233-4; Scythopolis 235-8; churches 238-42; Dyrhachium 242-4
- Bulgars (Bulgarians): raids 104-6; Priscian 273, 277
- Burgundians 6, 8, 9, 74, 88, 93-4, 97, 98 n.106, 99-100, 114, 251
- Caesarea (Mauretania) 274 n.7
- Caesarea (Palestine) 232-4, 235 n.32, 277-8
- Calabria 200
- Calendar of the Tur 'Abdin* 239
- Calendion, Patriarch of Alexandria 123-4, 139, 155
- Callatis 111
- Callinicum 61 n.131, 68 n.173
- Callinicus 176 n.309
- Calliopus, charioteer 227
- Calliopus, *comes orientis* 62, 65, 69 n.176, 221, 227
- Callistus, Bishop 158
- Calopodius 149
- Calycadnus, river 25
- capitatio humana et animalium* 221
- capitus* 45, 200
- Cappadocia 15, 18, 70, 175
- Cappadocia II 139
- Cappadocias 49
- Caravec 114 n.182
- Carinus 167, 170
- Carrhae 56, 60
- Carthage 76-7
- Caspian Gates 49-50, 53 n.85, 70
- Caspian Sea 48 n.67
- Cassiodorus 92 n.80, 265; *Variae* 87
- Caucasus 63, 218; mountains 49
- Cedrenus 4, 165, 194 n.51, 196, 247 n.4, 259
- Celer 58, 62-5, 148 n.141, 149, 151, 157, 192, 221, 247, 249, 259 n.35, 245, 263, 287 n.4
- Celerinus, *assessor* 167
- Cethegus, Flavius, consul 91 n.72
- Chalcedon 19; see also Council of Chalcedon
- Chalcis 20 n.49, 37
- chariot races 26, 85
- charioteers: see Calliopus, Porphyrius
- chartularius/ii* 191 n.37, 214
- Chersonese 15
- Childeric 95 n.93
- Chilperic II 96 n.98
- China 40, 251
- Chosroes 252
- Christodorus of Coptus 28 n.88, 255 n.1
- Chronicle of Seert (Nestorian History)* 270
- Chronicle of Zuqnin* 270 n.110
- Chronicon ad 846 pertinens* 267, 268 n.95, 270 n.110
- Chronicon anonymum ad A.D. 819 pertinens* 267
- Chronicon anonymum ad a.c. 1234 pertinens* 268
- Chronicon Edessenicum* 267
- Chronicon miscellaneum ad A.D. 724 pertinens* 267
- Chronicon Paschale* 226, 245, 247 n.4, 257, 259, 270 n.110, 277 n.16
- Chrysaphius 16 n.19
- Chrysargyron (*collatio lustralis*) 7, 108, 189 n.22, 191, 194-9, 202 n.93, 206 n.115, 211 n.143, 225, 260, 267, 275, 277
- Churches: at Amisa 239; S Apollinare Nuovo 85; St. Barlaam 241; St. Bartholomew, Dara 69; SS Cosmas and Damian, near Caesarea 242 n.58; St. Euphemia, Chalcedon 118; St. John the Baptist, Jordan 242; St. Leontius, near Tripolis 144; Santa Maria, Rome 133; St. Michael, Constantinople 239; St. Paul 134; St. Peter, Paris 96; St. Peter, Rome 134; St. Philip, Constantinople 239; St. Theodore, Constantinople 156; SS Sergius and Bacchus, Constantinople 39 n.37, 252; SS Sergius, Bacchus and Leontius, Bostra 37, 241-2; of the Archangel 148; of the Forty Martyrs, Amida 66 n.160, 240; of the Holy Apostles, Paris 96; of Prodomos, Constantinople 239; Great Church, Constantinople 4, 6, 127 n.39, 147-9, 151-2, 156, 167, 170, 221, 272; Great Church, Dara 69
- Cilicia 13, 14, 158, 220
- Cilicia Pedias 13, 14 n.10
- Cilicia Tracheia (Rough Cilicia) 13-14
- Cilicians 218-20
- Circesium 68 n.173
- cisterns 231
- Citharizon 65
- city prefect I n.3, 3, 22, 218
- clarissimus* 200
- classici* 218
- Claudiopolis 25
- Clementinus, Fl. Taurus Clementinus Amonius 192 n.39
- Clementius, patrician 150
- Clovis, King of the Franks 8, 86, 94-7, 266
- Clysma 40, 43 n.55, 44-7
- Codex Iustinianus* 191, 214, 262
- coemptio* 166, 186, 200-1
- coinage 185-7; Anastasius' reform 7, 202-6; Theoderic and coinage 84, 86
- collatio glebalis* 196
- collectarii* 187 n.14
- Collectio Avellana* 263
- coloni* 185, 212
- comes domesticorum* 16, 190 n.31
- comes foederatum* 164-6
- comes rei privatae/comes rerum privatarum* 188-9, 197, 198 n.73, 199 n.71
- comes sacrarum largitionum* 187-9; *comitiva sacrarum largitionum* 46, 191, 194, 196, 198 n.74
- comes sacri patrimonii* 198-9
- comitatenses* 186
- commercarius/ii* 45-6, 208 n.129, 218 n.176
- compulsor* 207
- Conon, Bishop of Apameia 20 n.46, 23-5
- consistorium/consistory 115, 190 n.31; *comites consistoriani* 222
- Constantia 56, 59-60, 68; *dux* 54 n.90
- Constantine I 115, 186, 194, 200, 260
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus 225 n.204, 257; *de Ceremoniis* 248 n.7, 262
- Constantine, *assessor* 167
- Constantine, Bishop of Seleucia/Isauria 145-6, 158
- Constantine, Governor of Theodosiopolis 54, 59
- Constantine, praetorian prefect 222, 284 n.4
- Constantinople *passim*; building projects 231-2, 234-5, 239; see also churches, monasteries, riots
- Constantinus, city prefect 226 n.211
- Constantius, Prefect of Rome 91 n.72
- Constantius II, Emperor 40, 199, 260
- consulship(s) *passim*; of Clovis 95-7; Anastasius' appointments 192-3
- Coracesium 14
- Corycus 209, 210 n.139
- Cosmas, Bishop of Epiphania 158
- Cosmas, Bishop of Qinneshrin 153-4
- Cotyaeum 24, 25 n.73
- Council of Chalcedon 115-83 *passim*; background and aftermath 116-24; neo-Chalcedonianism 146 n.132, 158
- Council of Constantinople 116, 121-3, 146
- Council of Constantinople 492: 136
- Council of Ephesus I 117, 122-3, 144, 146
- Council of Ephesus II (Robber Council) 118-19
- Council of Nicaea 115 n.2, 123, 135, 146
- Cresconius, Bishop 132
- curator* 188
- curia* 208-11, 235 n.33
- curiales* 187-9, 199 n.82, 207-11
- currency: see coinage
- cursus publicus* 189
- custom duties 8, 43-6, 208, 217-20
- Cyprus 14, 15 n.12, 69
- Cyrenaica 70, 214-15
- Cyril 169-70
- Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria 117-20, 122-3, 139, 144, 147; Letters 120; Twelve Chapters/Anathemas 117, 123, 145
- Cyril of Scythopolis 161 n.212, 194 n.51, 276, 261

- Dacia 91 n.74, 93, 98 n.110
 Dalisandus 18-19
 Dalmatia 74, 77; Bishops 130
 Daniel, *dux* of Pentapolis 215
 Daniel the Stylite, *Life* 107, 261
 Danube 15, 27, 76 n.14, 92-3, 98 n.110, 99, 112-14, 166; Danubian regions 167
 Dara (Anastasiopolis) 8, 27 n.86, 64, 68-70, 108-9, 238, 240, 244, 256-7, 259 n.31, 262 n.58, 268, 270, 276, 278
 Dardania, Bishops 89 n.65, 129-30
 Dariel Pass 49
 Decius, Caecina Mavortius Basilius 86
 decurions (*decuriones*) 188, 190 n.31, 211
defensor 188, 207, 209-10
 Demosthenes 46 n.60
 Dercos, Lake 106
 Dhu Nuwas 42
 Dimion/Dimnos, Himyarite King 41, 42 n.50
 Dinogetia 112
 Diocletian, Emperor 185 n.8, 190, 208, 212
 Diodore of Tarsus 116, 140, 141, 145, 149 n.144
 Diogenianus 24-5
 Dioscorus I, Patriarch of Alexandria 117, 119, 122, 124, 174
 Dioscorus II, Patriarch of Alexandria 132, 138 n.95, 161
 Domnio of Serdica 163
 Donatists 138 n.95, 115 n.2
 donative 5, 15, 20 n.45, 189 n.22
 Dorotheus, Bishop of Thessalonica 163-4, 181
 Dorotheus, Egyptian monk 147
dux/duces 29, 44-6, 199-200, 214-15
 Dyrrhachium 2, 242-4
 Edessa 20 n.49, 48 n.65, 56-7, 59-61, 64-6, 69, 140 n.100, 192 n.41, 195-6, 221, 266-7; School 139
 Egypt: administration of customs 46 n.61; religious policy 116, 121-3, 138, 156, 162, 250; provides grain supply 185 n.8, 232; office of pagarch 208-9
 Eirenaïos Pentadiastes, *comes orientis* 227
 Elias, Bishop of Nisibis 268
 Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem 36, 138, 144, 152-6, 158-61
 Ella Asheba, Ethiopian King 42
 Emesa 29, 67
 Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia 92, 98 n.106, 173, 175, 181, 266; *Libellus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumpserunt* 134 n.72, 266; Panegyric 266
 Entrichius, Governor of Scythopolis 238
 Ephesus: and religious policy 121, 123; see also Council of Ephesus
epibole 213
 Epidamnus 2
 Epiphanius of Tyre 156, 160
 Epirus 105; Nova Epirus 2
 Erelieva 89
ergatores 214
 Ethiopia (Ethiopians) 40-2
 Euchaïta 70, 151
 Eucherius, Bishop 140
 Eucolus 147 n.134
 Eudocia 172
 Eudoxia 76, 205
 Eugenius, *dux* of Armenia 56
 Eugenius, Roman commander 31
 Eulogius 66
 Euphemia (martyr) 149 n.144, 267
 Euphemius, Patriarch of Constantinople 1-2, 5-6, 9, 25, 126-30, 136-9, 175, 227 n.213, 250 n.14, 258, 260 n.41, 267
 Euphemius, praetorian prefect 221 n.187, 284 n.3
 Euphratensis 31
 Euphrates, river 60-1
 Euphratesia, metropolis of 142 n.11
 Euphratesia, province of 140
 Eupraxius, *cubicularius* 269
 Euric, Visigothic King 74 n.2
 Europa, province of 129
 Europus 65
 Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 238
 Eusebius, *magister officiorum* 192 n.42, 267, 286 n.3
 Eustathius, praetorian prefect 284 n.5
 Eustathius of Epiphania 33, 36 n.22, 256, 257 n.14, 258, 260, 269
 Eutharic 88 n.63, 250-1
 Euthemius of Tyre 141
 Euthymius, St. 122 n.22
 Eutropius, historian 264
 Eutropius, tribune 153-4
 Eutyches, archimandrite 117-19, 123, 124 n.26, 126, 129, 140, 143 n.115, 146, 148, 155, 161-2, 175; Eutychian heresy 135
 Eutychian, presbyter of Dara 69
 Evagrius 33, 36 n.22, 107, 108, 125, 126, 127 n.36, 148-9, 164-5, 168-9, 194

- n.52, 195, 208 n.125, 210, 211 n.144, 248-9, 255-6, 257 n.14, 259-60
 Evangelus of Pautalia 163
exactor civitatis 209
excubitores 17, 249
 factions: Vitalian and the factions 171-2, 177-8; riots 223-9, 231, 248, 252, 275, 276 n.12
 Faenza 79
 family legislation 7, 222-3
 Faustus Niger, Anicius Probus 81, 87, 91 n.72, 130, 133
 Felix, consul 265
 Felix III, Pope 124, 127-8
 Festus, Flavius Rufus Postumius 80, 82-3, 88, 90, 102 n.127, 132-5, 265
 Flavian, Patriarch of Antioch 127, 139-42, 145, 147, 151-5, 157-8, 160, 164 n.231, 169, 175 n.300, 260, 268
 Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople 117-19
 Florianus, Valerius 86
foederati: see army
 fortifications: see building programme
 Fortunatus of Caria 173
 Franks 6, 8, 88, 93-84, 97, 99 n.111, 100, 114, 251
 Fravitta, Patriarch of Constantinople 126
 Gaianus of Naissus 163
 Gaiseric 204
 Galata 178
 Galilee 15 n.12
 Gallic-Roman Church 94
 Gaul 74, 80, 87, 91, 94, 96, 97-9, 103, 104, 266
 Gaza 277
 Gelasius, Pope 81, 89, 90 n.67, 91 n.72, 115, 128-33, 135-6, 162 n.219; *de damnatione nominum Petri et Acacii* 128; Letter to Anastasius 494 131; *Tomus de anathematis vinculo* 131 n.60; *Tractatus* IV 131
 George Monachus 258
 George Syncellus 258
 Gepids 8, 79, 91-3, 99, 265
 Germanus 249
 Germanus, bishop 132
 Geta 171 n.276, 227
 Ghassanids 8, 33-7, 39, 41, 42 n.54, 53, 252
 Gildo 199
 Glon 56, 59
 Glycerius 74
 Golden Horn 178, 180
 Goths: and Isaurians 6, 11, 15-17, 21, 28;
- Theoderic and 76-80, 82, 85 n.49; and the Balkans 93, 98 n.110; see also Ostrogoths, Visigoths
 Gratian, Emperor 132 n.61
 Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch 259
 Gregory of Tours 96; *History of the Franks* 266; *Miracula* 266
 Gundobad 9, 74, 77 n.17, 79 n.30, 94 n.85, 97 n.106, 99, 100 n.116
 Gunthamund 204
 Gushnaspadh 51
 Hadrian, Emperor 14 n.10
 Hammat Gader 233-4, 245 n.74
 al-Harith 33, 252; see also Arethas (Kindite)
 Harpocratio 46 n.60
 Hebdomon 168
 Helias, city prefect 226 n.211
 Hellespont 118
Henoticon 1 n.4, 9, 20 n.48, 123-6, 128-41 *passim*, 145-8, 149 n.143, 151-5, 158-61, 180, 182-3
 Heraclea, see of 129
 Heracleopolis 196
 Heraclius, Emperor 257
 Heraclius, Isaurian leader 17
 Hermanfried, King of the Thuringians 94 n.85
 Hermanric 17 n.28
 Herodotus 107, 266 n.87
 Heruls 82, 99
 Hierapolis 63, 196, 232, 277-8
 Hierios, praetorian prefect 227
 Hieron 218, 219 n.180
 Hilary, notary 173
 Himyar (Himyarites) 33 n.11, 40-2
 Hind 40 n.41
 hippodrome 5, 22, 157, 191, 196; factions 224-9, 231; Dyrrhachium 242-3; *triklinos* 5; *kathisma* 5
 al-Hira 35 n.18, 39
 Hirta 35 n.20
 Hishām al-Kalbī 35 n.18
Histoire du couvent de S. Hanania 239
Histoire Nestorienne 126
 Histria 109-11
 Hiyyān 40
 Honorius, Emperor 76 n.13, 209, 212, 214 n.156, 239
 Hormisdas, Pope 90 n.67, 100-1, 115, 162-3, 167 n.243, 172-5, 180, 250, 260 n.41, 264-6, 274; *Libellus* 163, 173-4
 Hormisdas, praetorian prefect of Illyricum 243

- Horreum Margi 93
 Huns: in fifth century 15, 48, 74 n.3, 76, 91 n.74, 107 n.146; in the Isaurian war 24; in the Persian war 29, 50 n.73, 52, 56, 68, 70; Vitalian 165, 171, 176; Hephthalite Huns 48, 49 n.67, 52-3, 56, 59-60, 63 n.142; Kutrigur Huns 104 n.133; Sabir Huns 49, 63, 70, 175-6, 258; Utrigur Huns 104 n.133
 Hypatius, Anastasius' nephew 57-60, 62, 161, 164, 167 n.243, 168, 170-2, 193, 247, 249, 258, 262, 272-4
 Hypatius, *magister militum* 166 n.238, 167-9, 179, 258, 273
 Ibas of Edessa 116, 118, 139-41, 145
 Iberia 252
 Ibn Habīb, *al-Muhabbar* 35 n.18
 Ibn-al-Kalbi 33-4
 Ibn Khaldūn 33, 34
 Illus 3, 6, 7, 11 n.1, 18-23, 24 n.68, 75, 78 n.21, 124, 283
illustris/illustres 78 n.26, 85 n.50, 190, 199
 Illyricum 19, 76, 244, 273
 Imtān 44
 Indacus 17
 Indes 26
 India 43, 251
 Indian Ocean 33, 40
Indiculus 173
 Indus 48 n.67
 Innocentius, *comes* 104, 105 n.136
inquinini 212 n.147
 Iotabe 8, 42-7
 Irenaeus 81, 130
 Isauria (Isaurians) *passim*; rise in importance 1, 3, 6-7, 10-18; Zeno and the Isaurians 7, 18-21; Anastasius and the Isaurians 7, 21-8
 Isonzo, river 79
 Italy: Theoderic's status in 8-9, 73, 76, 80-9, 130-2; in the fifth century 74-5; Zeno sends Theoderic to 78-80; religious policy and 89ff, 100ff, 130-2; Anastasius sends fleet against 97; taxation 200-1; Ostrogoths in 250-1
 Jabalah 34, 36 n.21, 36 n.22, 42 n.54
 Jacobite Church 183
 Jafnal 34
 Jafnids 36 n.21
 James (Jacob) of Edessa 267
 Jerome 262
 Jerusalem 138, 144, 160-1, 172 n.281, 196; archbishop 119, 123; Church 261
 Jews 40, 42 n.51, 60, 227
 Jidh' 34
 John, abbot of Beith-Aphthonia; *Life of Severus (Vita Severi)* 143 n.116, 149, 269, 271; *Hymns* 267
 John Chrysostom 144
 John Diacrinomenus 41
 John Isthmeos 256 n.7
 John Moschus, *Pratum Spiritale* 261
 John Sa'oro 240-1
 John Scholasticus 126, 259
 John of Antioch 22-3, 24 n.66, n.73, 164-6, 168-71, 172 n.281, 175, 176 n.308, 178 n.315, 211 n.143, 226 n.211, 228 n.222, 243, 249, 257, 273, 283
 John of Claudiopolis 146
 John of Ephesus 269-70; *Ecclesiastical history* 269-70; *Lives of Eastern Saints* 270
 John of Nikiu 230
 John of Scythopolis 160 n.208
 John, son of Azizos 66
 John, son of Valeriana 172, 176, 192 n.41
 John the Cappadocian 190 n.28; praetorian prefect 252
 John the Grammarian 146 n.132, 158, 160 n.208
 John the Hunchback 25, 137, 193, 248
 John the Lydian 5, 49, 64, 191, 210, 211 n.144, 230, 262 n.51
 John the Paphlagonian 4, 7, 191-3, 202, 206, 276
 John the Scythian 3, 20, 24, 26, 193
 John the Tabennesiote 138 n.96
 John the Vandal 15
 John, Bishop 140
 John, Bishop of Amida 66 n.160
 John, Bishop-elect of Nicopolis 163
 John, Bishop of Ravenna 79
 John, Patriarch of Antioch 117, 141
 John II, Patriarch of Alexandria 138-9, 153
 John III, Patriarch of Antioch 142, 147, 152, 156, 159
 John II, Patriarch of Constantinople 182
 John, Patriarch of Jerusalem 161, 261
 John, praetorian prefect of Illyricum 105
 Jordanes 78 n.25, 79, 81 n.34, 82, 265
 Joshua the Stylite 50, 52 n.84, 54, 57, 59, 194 n.51, 195, 257, 260, 266, 270
 judicial system: improvements to 7, 223
 Julian, Bishop of Bostra 156, 158, 241-2
 Julian, city prefect 22, 225-6, 228 n.221
 Julian, Emperor 49
 Julian, *magister militum per Illyricum* 104
 Julianus of Halicarnassus 271
 Julius Nepos 74-5
 Justin I 7, 24, 42, 57, 88 n.63, 103 n.130, 114, 176 n.308, 179, 183-4, 235 n.30, 237 n.36, 247-52, 257, 260
 Justin II 111, 274 n.7
 Justinian *passim*; the *Nika* riot 5 n.22, 226 n.110; inherits legacy of Anastasius 6-7, 249-53; the Persian wars 8, 60 n.127, 64, 72; building projects 9, 35 n.17, 65, 67, 69-70, 108 n.153, 109, 111-14; Arab allies 37-8; the West 73, 76, 87 n.59, 88 n.63, 103; the Franks 95 n.93; murders Vitalian 179; religious policy 182 n.333, 183; commutation of the land tax 201 n.93; *vindices* 208 n.125, 209; agrarian legislation 212-13; customs 218 n.176, 219
 Juvenal, Archbishop of Jerusalem 122
 Kadishaye 52-3
 Kadousioi 163 n.142
 Kavadh 29-72 *passim*; invades Roman Armenia 29, 53; seeks financial help 31, 42, 47, 49, 52; imprisoned 51; regains throne 51; successfully besieges Amida 54-7; besieges Edessa 60-1; attempts to stop Roman siege of Amida 62-3; agrees peace 63-4; requests that Justin adopt his son 252
 Khoten 48 n.67
 Kindites 33-4, 36, 42 n.54, 53, 252
 Klearchus, Anastasius' uncle 127
 Kushans (Kidarites) 48 n.67
 Lakhmids 31, 39, 56, 60
 Landolfus: *Sagax* 264
 Lateran Basilica 133
 Laurence of Lichnidos 163
 Laurentian schism 90-1, 101, 132 n.61, 133-6, 264, 274
 Laurentius, anti-Pope 90-1, 102 n.127, 115, 133-5
 Lazica 252
 Leo I, Emperor 1 n.4, 7, 16-19, 21, 42-3, 74, 76, 122, 174, 184, 198, 205, 220
 Leo II, Emperor 17 n.22, 18
 Leo VI, Emperor 211
 Leo, Pope 118-20, 122, 162, 174; Tome of Leo 118-20, 124, 127 n.140, 135-6, 138, 140-2, 146-7, 152-3, 155, 157-8, 160-1, 174, 182 n.333, 183
 Leontia 17, 19
 Leontius, praetorian prefect 7, 191, 210, 284 n.6
 Leontius, St. 39
 Libanius 144
Liber Constitutionum 100 n.116
Liber Pontificalis 263
 Liberatus 264
 Libya 70, 123, 125, 215-16
Life of Samuel 240-1
 Lilingis, *comes et praeses Isauriae* 24
limitanei 29, 71, 199, 216
 Lingis 20 n.46
Lives of Three Saints 239
 Lombards 99, 103
 Long Wall: Thracian, Anastasian 9, 106-9, 114, 276, 278; Chersonese 107
 Longinus, Zeno's brother 1, 3, 6, 11, 18, 20-1, 23, 214, 226 n.212, 247
 Longinus of Kardala 3, 23, 24
 Longinus of Selinus 25-6
 Lycaonia 14, 175
 Lycia 14
 Mabbög (Hierapolis) 142-3
 Macedonia 20 n.43, 76, 93, 105, 222
 Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople 126, 132 n.64, 139, 140-1, 145 n.126, 146-52, 154, 164, 169, 175, 182, 260 n.41, 264, 267-71
 M'adikarib Y'afur 41
magister a libellis 1
magister militum per Thracias 106, 165 n.233, 167; see also John the Vandal, Vitalian, Hypatius
magister officiorum 46 n.61, 190 n.91, 218, 283; see also Cassiodorus, Celer, Eusebius, Illus, Longinus of Kardala
 Magna, Anastasius' sister-in-law 147
 Maiuma Festival 226 n.211
 Majorian, Emperor 200
 Malalas 4, 67 n.172, 164-5, 168-9, 176, 178 n.315, 194 n.51, 197, 208 n.125, 211 n.144, 224, 225 n.204, 226-7, 230-1, 242, 245, 247 n.4, 250, 255-60, 270
 Malchus 31 n.2, 107
 Mamas, Bishop of Euchaita 71
 Manichaeans (Manichees) 127, 135, 224 n.200
 Marcellinus *comes* 15, 22, 25, 26 n.80, 57, 67 n.172, 108, 142, 153 n.164, 156f, 163-4, 167 n.243, 168-9, 176 n.306, 202, 273, 225-6, 262; *de Temporum Qualitatibus et Positionibus Locorum* 262 n.58

- Marcian, Emperor 16, 21, 76 n.14, 77, 95 n.93, 118-19, 121-2, 174, 184 n.2, 185, 196, 200, 205
- Marcian, rebel 6, 19, 20 n.47, 171
- Mardin 142
- Margum 93 n.83
- Marinus of Beirut 156 n.184
- Marinus the Syrian 4, 7, 152 n.162, 157, 176-7, 190 n.28, 191, 207, 210 n.140, 210 n.141, 211 n.144, 222 n.193, 252, 256-7, 262, 269, 276, 284 n.7
- Marmara, sea of 106
- Maro, St. 17 n.185
- Maron of Anaxarbus 140
- Marsus 17
- Martad'ilan Yanif 41
- Martyrius, ambassador 171
- Martyrius of Jerusalem 124
- Martyropolis 54
- Marutha, Bishop of Maipherkat, *Life* 54 n.92
- Matasuntha, granddaughter of Theoderic 249
- Matronius, praetorian prefect 200, 223, 283
- Mauretania 200
- Maurianus, seer 4
- Maxentius, *dux* 167
- Mazdak (Mazdakism) 31 n.7, 51
- Mazices 70
- Megalos, Flavius, *archon* 235
- Melas, river 13
- Melilene 65
- Menas of Byzantium 227
- Mesembria 112
- Mesopotamia 45-6, 61-4, 68, 70, 221, 275; *dux* 69; Roman Mesopotamia 54-5
- Messala, Flavius 91 n.72
- Michael the Syrian 66 n.161, 141, 164, 268, 269-70 n.110
- Milan 79, 129
- military service: see army
- mints 203; Comitatusian *officium* 187; moneta publica 187
- Miserius, bishop of Cumae 124
- Moesia 77, 168, 171, 172 n.281
- Moesia I 93, 98 n.110
- Moesia II (Secunda/Lower) (Mysia) 77, 114, 164, 166, 167, 169
- Monasteries: of Bassianus 141; of Dalmatius 149-50; of Dion 141; of Mar John Urtaye, Amida 55; of St. Maron, Syria 181 n.329; of Matrona 141, 149; of Peter 144; of Qartmin 69-70, 239; of Romanus 144; Saffron 239; of Sēnūn 155; of the Sleepless Monks 141; Studios 152 n.157; of Theognius 242 n.60; of Zugnin, near Amida 266
- Morava, river 93
- Mukhā 41 n.46
- al-Mundhir III 39-41, 42 n.51, 61 n.133, 252
- Mundo 93, 98 n.110
- Musicianus, consul 108
- Musonius, Bishop 158
- Najran 40-2
- Naples 27 n.86
- negotiatores* 194
- neo-Chalcedonianism: see Council of Chalcedon
- Nephalius 144-5
- Nestorianism 40, 48 n.65, 145, 148; Nestorians 39, 48 n.65, 155, 224 n.200
- Nestorius 116-17, 119-20, 122-3, 124 n.26, 140-4, 146, 148, 155, 161-2, 174-5
- Nicaea 26
- Nicene Creed 119, 122
- Nicene/Constantinopolitan Creed 123
- Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus 259
- Nicomedia 232
- Nicopolis 163
- Nicostratus, *comes* 104, 105 n.136
- Nisibis 50-2, 59, 63, 68-9
- Nonnosus, ambassador 33, 36 n.22
- Nonnosus, *dux* 64 n.149
- notables 188, 210
- Noviodunum 112
- Nuceria, Campania 134
- al-Numan 31, 35 n.20, 39, 60 n.123
- numerarii* 215
- Nymphius 62
- Odessos 167-70
- Odoacer 8, 20 n.44, 21 n.53, 73-5, 78-85, 87, 92, 98 n.106, 199 n.77, 200 n.88, 204
- Ogaros 33, 35, 42 n.54
- Olybrius 58
- Olympius, *dux* of Mesopotamia 54 n.90, 56
- Olympius, Governor of Palestine 161
- optiones* 214
- Oracle of Apollo (Delphi, 511) 153-4
- Oracle of Baalbek 5, 206 n.117, 211 n.143, 262
- Orestes 74
- originarius/originalis* 212
- ornamenti palatii* 75, 83, 85 n.43, 87-8, 90, 102, 134, 265
- Osrhoene 62-3; *dux* 68 n.173

- Ostrogoths 6-8, 73-104 *passim*; Odoacer 75; Theoderic 79, 82, 97; the Gepids 92; the Franks 94; the Burgundians 100 n.117; coinage of the Ostrogoths 204, 205 n.110; position in Italy after Anastasius 250-1
- Ostrys 17
- Oxus, river 48 n.67
- pagans 40
- pagarch 208-9
- Palace, imperial 1-2, 17, 19, 148, 234, 246; Blachernae 234
- Palestina Prima 36, 61 n.133
- Palestina Tertia (Palestine III) 42, 43 n.55, 45 n.60, 67, 215
- Palestine 33, 36 n.22, 42 n.54, 45-6, 122, 139, 144 n.119, 160 n.208, 207 n.123, 215-16, 234, 242, 276; Palestinian monks 144, 148, 149 n.143, 155 n.176, 160 n.208
- Palladius, Patriarch of Antioch 139
- Pamphylia 13-14
- Pamprepius 21 n.51
- Pannonia 76-7, 91 n.74, 93
- Pannonia Bassianensis 98 n.110
- Pannonia Secunda 91 n.74, 92, 98 n.110
- Pannonia Sirmiensis 98 n.110
- Papirios, castle of 20-1, 23, 24 n.66
- Pascasius, deacon 133 n.69, Pascasius, monk 151
- Paternus, Bishop of Tomis 111
- Patriciolus 57, 61, 164-6, 275
- Patricius, Aspar's son 17
- Patricius, consul / *magister equitum* 57-63, 157, 168, 176, 249, 262
- patrimonium* 197-8, 213
- Paul I, Bishop of Najrān 41
- Paul II, Bishop of Najrān 41
- Paul, Anastasius' brother & consul 108, 193, 221 n.187
- Paul, deacon 67
- Paul, deacon 137
- Paul the Deacon (historian) 126, 264
- Paul, tribune 105-6
- Paulinus 193 n.49
- Pavia 79, 85
- Pelagius 3, 4
- Pentapolis 123
- Peregrinus, Bishop of Miserius, Campania 181
- Peroz, King of Persia 48, 51
- Persarmenia: see Armenia
- Persia 8, 15, 17 n.24, 20, 29-72 *passim*, 142-3, 251-2; Persians invade Roman Armenia 29, 53; Persian and Arab alliances 31, 35, 39; Persian-Roman relations prior to the Anastasian war 47-53; Persians besiege Amida 54-7; besiege Edessa 60-1; are besieged at Amida 62-3; peace agreed 63ff
- Peter Barsymes 190 n.28
- Peter Mongus 123-4, 126-7, 129, 153, 174
- Peter of Altinum 90, 134
- Peter of Apamea 158
- Peter of Damascus 156 n.184, 158
- Peter the Fuller 2, 124, 126, 137 n.86, 139
- Peter the Iberian 122, 139 n.97, 144
- Peter, St.: relics 85; see of 121
- Petilius Cerealis, Q. 205
- Petra 117 n.5, 155
- Pharesmanes 57, 59, 62, 69
- Philippopolis 17
- Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbög (Hierapolis) 9, 37, 39, 41, 125, 139-43, 145-6, 151, 153-5, 159-60, 175, 182, 240-1, 260, 267-8; *Letter to Abū Ya'fur* 39
- Phocas 112
- Phoenicia 15 n.12, 33, 36 n.22, 42 n.54, 67
- Phoenicia Libanensis 29
- Photinus, deacon 133
- Phrygia 24
- Pitzias 92-3
- Plato, city prefect 157, 226
- Pliny the Younger 232
- Polycarp 4, 190 n.28, 200; praetorian prefect 7, 191, 194
- Polychonius 171
- Pompeius, Anastasius' brother 151 n.155
- Pompeius, Anastasius' nephew 105 n.141, 193, 247 n.5
- Pompey the Great 13-14
- Pontus 15, 70, 121
- Porphyrus 177-9, 228-9
- Potamo 208
- praebitio tirorum* 201 n.91
- praepositus sacri cubiculi*; 2, 3, 64, 190 n.31, 248
- praetorian prefecture 4, 46, 78 n.26, 105, 106, 186 n.12, 189-210 *passim*, 207-10 *passim*; controlling budgets 189-90
- praetorian prefects: see Arcadius, Faustus, Hierios, Hormisdas (of Illyricum), John (of Illyricum), John the Cappadocian, Leontius, Marinus the Syrian, Matronius, Polycarp, Sebastianus, Sergius, Zoticus.
- principales* 207 n.124, 211 n.143

- Priscian 192, 194 n.53, 214 n.156, 228 n.222, 238, 244, 255 n.1, 272ff
- Priscus 26
- Probinus 133 n.69
- Probus, Marcus Aurelius 14
- Probus, Anastasius' nephew 193, 245 n.5
- Proclus, philosopher 176, 246, 256
- Procopius Anthemius, consul 100
- Procopius, brother of rebel Marcian 19
- Procopius of Antioch 46 n.61, 227
- Procopius of Caesarea 49 n.67, 53 n.88, 57, 60 n.121, 64, 67 n.172, 69, 107, 108, 111, 112, 213 n.155, 256, 258 n.23, 260; *de Aedificiis* 9, 65, 67, 109, 238, 261; *Anecdota (Secret History)* 216, 218-19, 248-9, 252 n.22; *Wars* 83, 261
- Procopius of Gaza 107, 194 n.53, 195, 228 n.222, 255 n.1, 272ff, 277-8
- procurator monetae* 202 n.94
- Proterius, Patriarch of Alexandria 122
- provincial governors 20, 189, 199 n.82, 209-10
- Ps-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre 266, 269, 270 n.110
- Ptolemais, Cyrenaica 44 n.57
- Ptolemais Edict 46 n.60
- Pulcheria, Empress 117-19, 121-2, 205
- Pullio, subdeacon 181
- Qasr al-Hallābāt 44, 46
- quaestors 222
- Quirus, Bishop 140
- Raetia 94
- Rasa el-Būz 66
- Ratiana (Dacia Ripensis) 113
- Ravenna 74, 76 n.13, 79-80, 85, 88, 90, 92 n.80, 129-30, 134, 173, 244, 265
- Red Sea 8, 33, 40-4, 53, 67, 251
- Rekitach 19 n.40, 77 n.21
- res privata* 7, 190, 197-9
- Resafa (Anastasiopolis/Sergiopolis) 31 n.7, 37-9, 65 n.156, 69, 244
- Resaina (Mesopotamian Theodosiopolis) 62
- Rhegion 106
- Rhodes, earthquake 221, 231, 256, 276 n.12
- Ricimer 74, 77 n.17, 179 n.321
- riots 5, 22-3, 115, 148, 151, 171, 223-9, 231, 252-3, 256-7, 263, 271-2, 275, 276 n.12; *Nika* riot 5 n.22, 223, 226 n.208, 231, 235 n.29, 247 n.6, 252; Trishagion 58, 156f, 227, 239, 260, 268, 270; riots in Constantinople 156-7, 225-9; riots in Antioch 226 n.209, 227, 231
- Rodulf (king of Heruls) 99
- Romanus 8, 34, 42, 43 n.55, 57, 61 n.133
- Rome ('Old Rome') 73-7, 88, 90, 91, 185, 204; visit of Theoderic to 8, 85; Church of 9, 114, 116, 118, 121-83 *passim*, 249-51
- Romulus Augustulus 73
- Royal Sassanid Chronicle* 51 n.79
- Rufinus, envoy of Anastasius 53, 57
- Rufinus, *magister militum per Thracias* 176
- Rufus, consul 86 n.53
- Rugians (Rugi) 75, 82
- Sabas, St. 36, 122 n.22, 152, 158, 161, 194 n.51, 222 n.193, 234 n.26, 242, 261
- Sabinianus 19 n.37, 92 n.80, 93
- Sacidava 112
- sacrae largitiones* 190, 197-8, 201 n.91, 207
- sacrum cubiculum* 197
- St. Sophia 27 n.86, 238, 260
- Salihids 33-4, 36
- Salkhad 44
- Sallustius, brother of Silvanus 237, 238
- Sallustius, Patriarch of Jerusalem 138
- Samaritan revolt 235 n.30
- Samosata 60-1
- Samuel, Monophysite Archimandrite 150
- Saracens 15
- Sarmatians 79
- Sava valley 92
- Scandinavia 99
- schism 1, 2, 9-10, 115-36 *passim*, 180-3; doctrinal schism of 491-516: 89-91; doctrinal schism of 516: 100f; see also Acacian schism, Laurentian schism
- Scythia (Scythians) 109 n.157, 111-12, 114, 166, 168, 171, 272-3; Scythian monks 166 n.237
- Scythopolis 233-5
- Sebastianus 7
- Secundinus, city prefect 22, 172 n.281, 193, 225 n.206
- Selymbria 106
- Senate 185, 190 n.31, 196, 208 n.126, 209; support of sought by Anastasius and Theoderic 84-7, 100-2, 180, 264; and the Church 91 n.72, 131 n.59, 133; of Carthage 205 n.110; of Constantinople, role in accession 1-2, 141, 172, 247-9; of Rome 75, 205 n.110

- senators, of Rome and Constantinople 251
- Septimius Severus 197
- Sergius, Bishop of Birtha 16 n.162
- Sergius, Bishop of Philadelphia 158
- Sergius, Bishop of Resafa 38
- Sergius, praetorian prefect 7, 191
- Sergius, St. 37, 39
- Severianus, envoy 100
- Severianus of Arethusa 158
- Severianus, *comes sacri consistorii* 180
- Severus, Bishop of Ashmunain, *The History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria* 271
- Severus, Patriarch of Antioch 9, 37, 39, 125-6, 143-62, 164, 175, 182, 241-2, 250, 260, 264, 267-71; Severan embassy 141; *Formula of Satisfaction* 146, 280-1; *Philalethes* 144; Hymns 267
- Severus Alexander, Governor of Scythopolis 235
- Servilius Vatia, P. 13-14
- Sicily 27 n.86
- Sigismund 9, 94, 99-100
- Sigizan 24
- silentiary 2 n.6, 3, 190 and n.31, 222-3; see also Anastasius, Pelagius
- Silvanus, Bishop 41
- Silvanus, brother of Sallustius 237-8
- Silvanus, son of Marinus 237
- silver stamps 205-6 n.115
- Simeon, Mar 142, 270
- Simeon, abbot of Teleda 153, 160
- Simeon of Amida, presbyter/monk at Constantinople 150, 151 n.153
- Simeon the Stylite, St. 162
- Simplicius, Pope 124
- Singidunum 99 n.112
- Sinoe, lake 111
- Sipontum 97
- Sirmium 8, 87, 91-3, 98 n.110, 129, 244, 265
- Sitifensis 200
- sitona* 188, 209 n.135, 210
- Siyāvash 51
- Slavs 105 n.138, 244; invasion of 109
- Sleepless Monks 124, 126 n.31, 139
- Sogdia 48 n.67
- solatio* 214
- soldiers: see army
- Solon, Bishop of Isauria 125, 158
- Sophanene 54
- Sosthenium 170, 172, 179
- Soterichus, Bishop of Caesarea, Cappadocia 148 n.141, 153, 161
- Souda 27 n.86, 243
- Sozopolis, Pisidia 143-4, 171, 172 n.281
- spahbadh* 63-4
- Spain 74
- spectabilis* 200
- Sporacius 49
- sportulae* 214, 218-19
- Stephen, Bishop of Gabbula 66
- Stephen, Bishop of Tripolis 208 n.125
- Stratonis 111
- Sueves 74
- suffragium 7
- susceptores* 208 n.126
- Sycae 176-7
- Symmachus 251
- Symmachus, Pope 90-1, 100, 115, 133-6, 162 n.219, 163 n.222, 173, 180, 274; *Apologeticus adversus Anastasiam imperatorem* 135, 264
- Synods: Alexandretta, Cilicia 513-515: 146 n.132; Antioch 508/509: 145-7; Antioch 513: 155, 158-60; Antioch 515: 160; Constantinople 497: 140; Constantinople 499: 140-1; Constantinople 507: 141; Constantinople 511: 151; Constantinople 536: 268; Heraclea 116, 159, 172; Laodicea 512: 155 n.179; Rome 499: 85 n.51; Rome 502: 90-1, 134; Sidon 511/512: 48 n.65, 142 n.110, 152-4; *Synodus Palmaris* 134, 266; Tyre 159-60, 161 n.212
- Syria 15 n.12, 33, 42 n.54, 49, 139, 143, 152, 154, 160 n.208, 241-2, 250
- Syria Prima/I 66, 145
- Syria Secunda/II 66, 139, 160, 223
- al-Tabari 270
- Tablettes Albertini* 204 n.105
- Tamuraye 52-3
- Tancus 104, 105 n.136
- Taroutia (Kerrāṭn) 66, 67 n.167, 241 n.56
- Tarrach 179
- Tarsus 20, 25-6
- Taurus Mountains 13, 14, 31 n.7
- taxation 184-90; cancellation of taxes 62-5, 70, 221-2; collection of tax 207-9; customs tax 217-20; see also *chrysargyron*, agrarian legislation
- Tha'laba Ibn 'Amr 35, 36 n.21, 42 n.54
- Tha'labites 35 n.18, 35 n.20, 36 n.21
- Thebaid 23
- Theocritus, *comes domesticorum* 248
- Theodahad, successor to Theoderic 87 n.59, 88 n.63, 251

Theodebert 95 n.93
 Theoderic, son of Theodemir:
 constitutional position 8, 73, 80-9,
 102-4, 128; Church politics 9, 89-91,
 102-4, 130-6; sent by Zeno to Italy 21
 n.53, 78-9; defeats Odoacer 79-80;
 and the Balkans 91-3, 243 n.74, 244;
 alliances 93-100; and Vitalian 165
 n.232; and coinage 204; and finance
 199 n.77; succession 250-1; see also
 Matasuntha, Theoderics
 Theoderic, son of Triarius 17, 19; see
 also Theoderics
 Theoderics: Zeno and 6, 19-20, 77
 Theodore, Guardian of Euchaita 71
 Theodore, *vindex* 208 n.125
 Theodore Lector 69, 148, 149, 166, 193
 n.48, 230, 257-8, 259 n.35, 260
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 116, 140-1, 145,
 149 n.144
 Theodoret of Cyrrhus 117 n.5, 118, 140,
 141, 145
 Theodorus, envoy 168-70, 263
 Theodorus, satrap 54
Theodosian Code 194, 212
 Theodosiopolis 29, 53, 56, 65; see also
 Resaina
 Theodosius I, Emperor 49, 205
 Theodosius II, Emperor 15-16, 21, 31
 n.2, 48, 107 n.146, 116-18, 122, 131
 n.60, 205, 214 n.156, 239, 243, 260
 Theodosius, Governor of Alexandria 227
 Theodosius, monk 161
 Theodosius, Patriarch of Jerusalem 122
 Theophanes the Confessor 25 n.73, 31,
 33-5, 36 n.21, n.22, 42-3, 59, 126,
 140, 141, 150, 153 n.164, 165, 167
 n.243, 168-9, 194 n.51, 246, 247 n.4,
 257-8, 260
 Theopompus 100
 Theopompus, *comes domesticorum* 180
 Thermopylae 105
 Thessalonica 205, 211 n.145, 244 n.69
 Thessaly 20 n.43, 105, 222
 Thomas, Bishop of Amida 68-9
 Thrace 19, 27, 76, 78, 104-6, 108, 121,
 165-6, 168, 172 n.278, 186, 201
 Thrasamund, King of the Vandals 94,
 114
 Thucydides 195, 266 n.87
 Tigris, river 62, 66
 Timostratus, *dux* 63
 Timothy (White Turban) 122
 Timothy of Gaza 196
 Timothy Aelurus, Patriarch of
 Alexandria 122-3, 174

Timothy IV, Patriarch of Alexandria 250
 Timothy, Patriarch of Constantinople
 152, 159, 163, 181-2, 250
 Timothy, *protector* 170
 Tiran 43 n.55
 Tisza, river 99
 Tolbiac, Battle of 94
 Tomis 111
 Totila 27 n.86, 103
 Tours 94 n.92, 96
 trade 40-7, 232, 245
 Traseric 92-3
 Triers 129
 Tripolis 208
 Trishagion 137, 147, 148 n.138, 151,
 156, 162, 227, 239, 256, 258, 260,
 264, 268, 270
 Trocundes 18-19, 21 n.51
 Troesmis 113 n.175
 Tropaeum Traiani 111
 Tufa, *magister militum* 79
 Tur 'Abdin 66, 239
 Tzanni 15, 70
 Tzurta, river 104

 Ulmetum 112
 Umm al-Jimāl 44
 Uranius 171
 Urbicius 2, 3, 64, 65 n.153, 234, 242

 Valens 187, 194
 Valentinian I 131 n.60, 187, 194, 199,
 205, 208
 Valentinian III 74, 76 n.13, 203, 205, 212
 Vandals 8, 17, 48, 74, 76, 94, 184, 200,
 203-4, 205 n.110
 Vatican 134
 Venantius, priest 173
 Verina 18-20
 Verona 79
 Vesuvius 156 n.187
 Via Egnatia 2, 243
vicarius 216
 Victor of Tunnuna 140, 263
vindex/vindices 46 n.61, 188, 207-10,
 211 n.144, 276, 284 n.7
 Visigoths 8, 74, 79, 88, 93-5, 97
 Vitalian 100, 116, 214, 250; in the
 Persian war 57-8, 61; consequences
 of the revolt for religious policy 159-
 61; *magister militum per Thracias*
 172, 176; revolt 164-79
 Vitalis, deacon 124, 173
 Vouillé, Battle 94

Wadi Arabah 215

 Ya'qūbī 33-4
 Yathrib (Medina) 40
 Yemen 40, 42
 Yezdegerd I 48
 Yezdegerd II 48

 Zabad 37
 Zachariah of Mytilene 4, 5, 54, 68, 126,
 143 n.116, 150, 159, 164-5, 259, 268-
 70
 Zachariah Scholasticus: *Life of Severus*
 (*Vita Severi*) 141, 143 n.116, 149,
 153, 268-9, 271
 Zafār 40-1
 Zalbada 164

 Zamasp 51
 Zeno, Emperor 1-9, 16-17, 22-5, 28, 35
 n.17, 48 n.65, 50, 52, 107, 171, 220,
 226 n.212, 228 n.224, 247, 255, 271;
 internal revolts 18-21; Theoderic 73,
 75-81, 84, 87-8, 92, 101 n.124, 103,
 104 n.133; doctrinal schisms and the
 Henoticon 123-6, 141, 143 n.115; the
 economy 184, 192, 198, 203, 205,
 211 n.146
 Zeno, Flavius 15-16
 Zenobia (Halebiya) 67
 Zolbo 24
 Zonaras 4, 259
 Zosimus 195
 Zoticus 191, 213 n.153, 221 n.187, 284
 n.7

